



P R E F A C E.

Because the Doctrines of the Church are, as by some wittingly mis-related, so by many others ignorantly mistaken; the Author thought it might be useful for the informing of those, who are withheld from professing Truth, only because they do not know it, nor because they like it, or prefer some certain interest before it, to draw up some brief Catholick *Theses*, as well negative as affirmative, extending to most of the principal Points of Controversy between the Roman and Reformed Churches. In which *Theses* he Professeth, That there is not any thing wittingly denied that is affirmed by any allowed Council. Nor any thing affirmed that is in any such Council denied. Nor any thing affirmed or denied here, but what, if not in Council, yet in some Catholick Writers (unconfuted by the Church) may be shewed to be so; and all to be bounded within such a Latitude of Opinion, as the Church indulgeth. For the more evidencing whereof such Propositions, as he conjectured might be, by some less read and experienced, any way doubted of, whether acknowledged and received by Roman-Catholics, He hath confirmed, either with the Testimonies of approved Catholick Divines, or (which might have more weight with some Readers) the Concessions of Learned Protestants; leaving only so many of these

ad

A

Theses.

The Preface.

Theses unguarded, as he presumed their own Perspicuity would secure. But here : The Author pretends not, that all is comprehended in these *Theses* which hath been delivered by Councils in all these Points, because this he thought both too tedious a Task, and needless ; since the main Points are here comprised ; and the intelligent Reader will discern, That many of those omitted may be readily inferred by necessary consequence from those here expressed ; and since he, who in these concurs with the Church's Judgment, must needs so much reverence it, as easily in this rest to resign himself to it. Nor doth he pretend, that no Catholick Author of good esteem delivers the contrary to any Proposition here set down (&c. &c. such of them as have not been the Determinations of Councils) : For the Church herein allows a Latitude of Opinions ; and he thought it sufficient to his Purpose to shew, that none, to be esteemed true Sons of the Church Catholick, and right Professors of her Faith, need to be of any other Perswasion than this here delivered ; and nor that all are, or must be of it. And strange it were, for say on this account only to desert the Church, because he can produce some persons in it that hold a thing he conceives false or unreasonable, whilst the same Mother indulgeth him to hold only that which he thinks rational and true. For any therefore to gather a Body of such Testimonies (except those of Councils) against any of these *Theses* is labour lost ; so long as he cannot produce some obligation laid upon all to conform to such Opinions, or follow such a Party ; and so long as the Church equally spreads her lap to all those who think, or say, otherwise. Nay further, could he produce some Catholick Author of good repute affirming the contrary to something here said, to be the Doctrine or Faith of the Church, or something here said to be

The Preface.

be contrary to it : yet neither is this conceived to the purpose, unless his saying it is so, proves it to be so. For learned Author, possibly, for the greater reputation of his Doctrine, may be too facile to entitle the Church to it, either as supposing it deducible, by some necessary consequence, from some Decree thereof ; or as contracting the words of such a Decree to a more particular sense, than the Council intended them, or indeed had light, either from Scripture, or Tradition Apostolical, precisely to determine ; and sometimes so it hath hapned, that contrary opinions have both of them urged the same Church Decree (couched only in more general Expressions) as deciding the Controversy, their own way. But it is here reasonably desired ; That such Conciliary Decree it self be produced and well examined ; and those Authors put in the other Scale who are here shewed to maintain, that to be well consistent with, or also to be the Church's Doctrine, which some others perhaps may pronounce contrary to it. It not being the Author's Design in this Collection to shew that Roman Catholicks agree in all things here said, but that none, to be true Roman Catholicks need to hold or say, any thing otherwise. By this to remove out of the way that great Scandal and Stumbling-block of well-inclined, but mis-informed Protestants, who apprehend, that such gross Errors in Faith and Manners, as no sober and rational Christian can with a good Conscience subscribe, are not only held and tolerated in the Roman Church, but also by it imposed. The Author hath also endeavoured in these *Theses* to descend so far to several particulars and circumstantial, as that the intelligent may easily discern them applicable to the solution of most doubts such as are material ; and to the explanation of his meaning, where to some Readers seeming am-

The Preface.

bigness or obscure; and they may serve them well. Comment or Exposition so most be both written; wherein his principal Design hath ever been (Truth always preserved) Unity, and the Peace of the Church of God: a design which can never be compleated whilst new Writings still succeed the former, till by the Divine Mercy these present Differencies arrive unto their just period;

CATHO-

CATHOLICK THOSES

On several Chief

HEADS of CONTROVERSY.

HEAD. I.

Concerning the Church, Her being a Guide.

1. Catholicks do affirm, That our Saviour's gracious Promises of Indefectibility, *Matt. 16. 18, 19. — 28. 19, et al.*
20. Jo. 14. 16. 26. — 16. 13. comp. Matt. 17. 27. — 14. Concerning
Jo. 5. 20. 27. Matt. 18. 20. comp. 17. 18. 1. Tim. 3. 15. — 2. the Church:
Tim. 2. 19. comp. 16. 17. Eph. 4. 11. 13. made to his Church are her being, or
so to be understood, not only, that his Church shall never fail, Guide.
or fall away as to Doctrine or Manners, if she do her duty,
(as some expound them.) But also that his Church shall never fail to do her duty, for what is necessary to Salvation, and
that these his words are not an hypothetical, but absolute
Prediction that his Church shall never fail.
2. That such Promises belong to the Church Catholick as
a Guide.
3. That this indefectibility of the Church as a Guide doth
extend to an inerrability, as in all Fundamentals (in which
if it errs it is no more a Church:) So in all other points, the
contrary Tenents to which are dangerous to Salvation: For
there seemeth to be no reasonable ground of a Restraint of our
Saviour's Promises (made indefinitely) narrower then this.
4. Amongst the several ways whereby the Church Catholick
may deliver her judgment as a Guide (whether by Mes-
sengers, Communicatory Letters, or Councils) that consist-

Catholick THESES.

of judgment, or those Councils which are the most universal (as the times and places are capable thereof) and which are the most dignified also with the presence of the most eminent Church Magistrates conveing therein, must needs be also the most supreme Guide of Christians.

5. That therefore no inferior, or subordinate Person, or Synod, when they are known to oppose this Supreme, may be taken by particular Persons for their Guide in Spiritual matters.

6. Now for a mid part of the Fathers in these Supreme Councils, differing from the rest, or out of these Councils, a minor part of Christian Churches opposing the rest, may be followed as our Guide: For so, notwithstanding these Guides appointed us, we are left in the same uncertainty for our way, as if we had none, except only when all of them unanimously agree; and if of two parties opposite, it is left to us to choose which we will, to guide us, it is all one for those points wherein these differ, as if we were left to guide our selves.

H E A D . I I .

Concerning the Church Catholick of several Ages her being equally this Guide.

Concerning the Church Catholick of several Ages her being equally this Guide. 1. IT is affirmed: That the Church Catholick of every Age, since the Apostles, and consequently the Church Catholick of this present Age, hath the same Indefectibility in Truth, and authority in Goverment, as that of any other; her being equally this Guide for the preserving of Christianity in one Age as in another; and that our Saviour's Promise of Indefectibility is made good to the Church Catholick of every Age taken distinctly. Else his Promise that the Church of all Ages should not fail would sufficiently be verified, if that of any one Age hath not failed.

2. From hence it is gathered; That the present Catholick Church of any Age can never deliver any thing contrary to the Church of former Ages, in necessary matters of Faith or Manners.

3: Sup-

H E A D . II .

3. Supposing that in matters not so necessary, the Catholick Church of severall Ages should differ; yet that the former having no more Promise of not erring herein then the later, therefore a Christian hath no greater security of the not erring of the one, then of the other; and therefore ought to acquiesce in the Judgment of the present, under whose regency and guidance God hath actually placed him.

4. If for the performance of Christian Obedience there be any necessity to have such Points, as these first decided, viz. What former Councils have been lawful and obliging, and what unlawful? What are fundamental and necessary Points of Faith, and what not necessary? What is the Doctrine of the Ancient Church in such and such Controversies? And what is the true sense of the Fathers Writings, or of a Councils Decree? If these, I say, (or so far as these) are necessary to be known by him; it follows that in these, a Christian ought also to submit to the Resolutions of the present Church Catholick, so far as it hath or shall decide them unto him (i. e. to the Resolution of the supremest Authority thereof, that he can arrive to) and herein to acquiesce. For thus far he is secure, that in things necessary she cannot misguide him. And it seems unreasonable, That when she is appointed his infallible Guide in all Points necessary (See Num. i. Ibid. 1.) He, nor she should undertake to judge what Points are necessary, and what not; for this is in effect to choose himself, in what particular Points she shall guide him, and in what not? Unreasonable, when he is obliged to obey her Councils, lawful, and ought to be owned by her; for this is in effect to choose what Councils he pleafeth to command his obedience, and exclude the rest. Unreasonable, when he is to learn of her what is the Doctrine and true Sense of the Holy Scriptures, that He, nor she should judge what is the Doctrine of Antiquity, or the true sense of former Fathers, or Councils, wherein the present Church accords with, or departs from, them; i. e. that she, that is his Judge in greater Matters, may not be so in the less.

H E A D .

C A S H

Catholick THESES.

Concerning the necessary Tradition of the former Ages of the Church, for all the Points of Faith that are taught in the present.

*Concerning
the necessary
Tradition of
the former
Ages of the
Church for
all the points
of Faith that
are taught in
the present.*

Catholicks brant, That every Article of Faith is to all later Ages, derived either in express terms, or in its necessary Principles from the times of the Apostles.

2. And consequently, That no Article of Faith can be justly received in any later Age, which was not acknowledged as such in all the former; i.e. either in express terms, or in its Principles.

3. But, as it is not hence necessary that every Article of Faith professed in a later Age, be professed also in express Terms in the former.

4. Nor is that all those Articles that are professed by a former Age must needs be found in those Writers we have of the same Age. For all their Writings are not now extant; nor will that they professed necessarily written; but only such things, of which the Suppression of Sects, instruction of the times, or the Author's particular design ministered occasion.

As that Rule of *Vincentius Luticeensis*, is allowed most true; *Illiud tenendum quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.* So this, *Nihil tenendum nisi quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est,* especially as it is restrained to, and required to be shewed and verified in the Writers of former Ages, and in these not in respect of Principles of Faith, but all the deductions too, as affirmed most erroneously; and such as if the *omnibus* and *semper* be not confined to the Members only of the Catholick Communion, one particular Church, or Person, in any Age, Heretical will void the Catholick Faith.

ДАДН

HEAD.

(5)

H E A D. IV.

So also concerning the Canonical Scriptures.

1. Catholicks do profess, That as the Church Governors, *Concerning the Canon of Scripture.*
or General Councils, can make no new Article of Faith
(See H. 5. Num. 2.) So neither new Canon of Holy Scrip-
ture; and that no Book can be part of these Holy Scriptures
now, which hath not been so always since the Apostles days.
But notwithstanding this,

2. It must be granted; That in some former Ages, and
Churches fewer Books have been acknowledged, and received
as the Canon of Scripture, than in some other later Churches
and Ages; and some Books by some, in some Ages doubted of,
which now all accept.

3. That where any such doubt ariseth, the Governours of the
Church have Power and Authority (and that not more in one
Age, than in another) to decide and declare, what particular
Books are to be esteemed and received as Canonical, and descen-
ding to Posterity as such from the Apostles times, and what not.

4. All those Books are received by Catholicks as Ca-
nonical which the most or more General Councils [See the
Council in *Trullo*, *Can. 2.* accepting the Council of
Carthage, as well as of *Laodicea*. Council of *Trent*, *Sess. 4.*
under *Pius* the Third; ratified in full Council *Sess. alt.* under
Pius, and accepted by all the Western Churches, save the Re-
formed: Or according to St. *Austine's Rule*, *De Doctrina
Christianorum*, 2. 1. 8. c. *In Canonicis autem Scripturis Ecclesiasticis
Catholicarum quam plurimum autoritatem sequatur Inter
quas sane illae sunt, qua Apostolicas sedes habent & Epistolas* [i. e. *communicatorias*] *ab illis Ecclesiis Apostolicis accipere ne-
ruerunt] or the more, and more dignified, Churches Catholick
have received and used for such.*

5. There is no more assent or belief required upon Ana-
them by any Council, concerning those Books of the Canon
which the Reformed call in question than this: *Ut pro Satris*

Catholick THESES.

& Canonicis suscipiantur. So Council Trid. Sess. 4. *Si quis libros ipsos &c. pro Sacris & Canonicis non suscepit, Anathema sit.* But these words by some imposed upon that Council, (See Bishop Cosm, §. 81. p. 103.) *Si quis omnes libros, pari Pietatis affectu, reverentia & veneratione pro Canonicis non suscepit, Anathema sit,* are not found there.

Next, *Concerning the Sufficiency of this Canon of Scripture, as a Rule (or that, which contains in it the matter) of the Christian Faith.*

Concerning the sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for the Rule of Faith.

1. Catholicks concede the holy Scriptures to contain all those Points of Faith, that are simply necessary by all persons to be believed for attaining Salvation: — to contain them, either in the conclusion it self, or in the Principles, from which it is necessarily deduced. And contend that out of the Revelations made in the Scriptures, as expounded by former Tradition, the Church from time to time defines all such points; except it be such Practicals, wherein the question is only, whether they be lawful; for the deciding of which lawfulness, it is enough if it can be shewed that nothing in Scripture, as understood by Antiquity, is repugnant to them.

2. But, *2dly*, The sense rather then the letter being God's word, they affirm; that all such Points are not so clearly contained in the words of Scripture, as that none can mistake or wrest, the true sense of those words.

3. And therefore, *3dly*, They affirm the Church's Tradition, or traditive Exposition, of these words of Scripture, necessary for several Points to be made use of, for the discerning and retaining the true sense, which under those words is intended by the Holy Ghost, and was in their teaching delivered by the Apostles to their Successors: [wherein yet they make not the Tradition or delivering of this Sense, but the Sense delivered (that is the Scripture still for these Points) their Rule, or that which contains the matter of their Faith: the oral expression or exposition thereof being only the same thing with its meaning or sense; and why are the Scriptures quoted by them but because the matter is there contained?]

4. They contend that there are many things, especially in the

H E A D. IV.

7

the governing of the Church, in the Administration of the Sacraments and other sacred Ceremonies, which ought to be believed and practised, or conformed to, that are not expressly set down in the Holy Scriptures; but left in the Church by Apostolical Tradition, and preserved in the Records of Antiquity, and constant Church-custome: in several of which Protestants also agree with them in the same Belief and Practice. ⁸ And amongst these Credends *extra Scripturas* is to be numbered the Article concerning the Canon of Scripture. ⁹

* S. Thom. 22. 1. q. art. 9. *primum*, & ad *primum*. Art. 10. *ad primum*. In *Doctrina Christi & Apostolorum* [he means *scripturae*] *veritas fidei est sufficienter explicata*: *Sed, quia perversi homines Scripturas pervertant, ideo necessaria sunt temporibus precedentibus explicatio fides contra insurgentes errores.*

Bellar. de verbo Dei non scripto, 4. l. 11. c. *Illa omnia scripta sunt ab Apostolis, quo sunt omnibus simpliciter necessaria ad salutem.* The main and substantial points of our Faith (faith F. Fisher in Bishop W'bite, p. 12.) are believed to be Apostolical, because they are written in Scripture.

* See Dr. Field, 4. l. 20. c. Dr. Taylor, *Episcopacy asserted*, §. 19. Reasons of the University of Oxford against the Covenant published 1647. p. 9. Where they speak on this manner. 'Without the consentient judgment and practice of the Universal Church (the best Interpreter of Scripture in things not clearly expressed, for *Lex currit cum Praxi*.) We should be at a loss in sundry Points both of Faith and Manners, at this day firmly believed, and securely practised by us; when by the Socinians, Anabaptists, and other Sectaries we should be called upon for our Proofs. As namely sundry Orthodoxal Explications concerning the Trinity and Co-equality of the Persons in the God-head, against the Arians and other Hereticks; the number, use and efficacy of Sacraments; the Baptizing of Infants, National Churches, the Observation of the Lord's Day, and even the Canon of Scripture it self.

* Dr. Field, 4. l. 20. c. * We reject not all Tradition; for first we receive the number and names of the Authors of

Books, Divine and Canonical, as deliverod by Tradition.
 'Mr. Chillingworth, i. l. 8. c. When Protestants affirm against
 'Papists that Scripture is, *A Perfect Rule of Faith*; their
 'meaning is not that by Scripture all things absolutely may
 'be proved which are to be believed; For it can never be
 'proved by Scripture to a Gain-sayer, That the Book called
 'Scripture is the word of God.

H. E A D.: V.

Concerning the perpetual use and necessity in all Ages of New Determinations and Definitions in matter of Faith to be made by the Church.

Concerning the necessity of the Church in several Ages to make new Definitions in matter of Faith.

1. IT is granted by Catholicks, That all Points of Faith, necessary to be known explicitly by every one for attaining Salvation, are delivered in the Scriptures, or other evident Tradition Apostolical: or also all those of speculative Faith so necessary delivered in the Apostles Creed. 2. Granted also, That the Church Governoirs since the time of our Saviour and his Apostles have no power to Decree, or impose any new Doctrine as of Faith, or to be believed as a Divine Truth, which was not a Divine Truth formerly revealed either explicitly, in the like terms, as they propose it; or implicitly at least in its necessary principles, and premises out of which they collect it. Nor have power to decree or impose any new thing as of necessary Faith, or necessary to be believed to Salvation: [that is] necessary *absolutely* to be, by all persons whatever (some of whom may be blamelessly ignorant of what the Church hath defined) after such Decree, known or believed explicitly with reference to attaining salvation, which was not so necessarily formerly. 3. Yet notwithstanding this, Catholicks affirm, that there are many divine truths which are not explicitly and in *terminis* delivered in the Scriptures, Apostles Creed, or express Tradition Apostolical, but only educible *de novo* by most necessary and certain

certain consequence from those which are so delivered; which are necessary to be determined and delivered by the Church of later Ages, when contrary Errors happen to appear.

+ Accordingly they affirm, That, upon the appearance of several such dangerous Errors, the Church did lawfully, in the four first General Councils, make and deliver some new Definitions in matters of Faith; [new taken in the sense expressed above, Num. 2.] did lawfully enlarge the former Creed; and require assent or belief (in the sense explained above, Num. 3.) unto these new Definitions under pain of Anathema.

5. They maintain, that all such dangerous Errors have not appeared within the times of the four first General Councils, nor those Councils defined all divine Truths contrary to such Errors, and therefore that, the Church in later Ages may use, against these, her Authority, to do the same things in her following Councils, as in the four first.

6. And consequently that it is not reasonable to require of the Church, that her Definitions be shewed. (I say not in their necessary Principles, on which she grounds them, but) in their formal Terms; either in the Scriptures, or her four first Councils, or in the now extant Writings of the first Ages.

7. Nor necessary; that every explicite Tradition Apostolical, and Principle that hath descended to the Church of later Ages, most certainly thro all the former, must therefore be shewed to be asserted or mentioned in the Writers of the former, especially, where these very few.

H E A D. V L^e*Concerning Subordination of Ecclesiastical Authorities.*

Catholicks maintain a due Subordination both of Ecclesiastical Persons among themselves; viz. Of Presb^{ter}s Subordinators to Bishops; Bishops to Metropolitans; Metropolitans to Primates, Primates to Patriarchs; And of Ecclesiastical Synods; viz. Diocesan to Provincial; Provincial to Patriarchal; Patriarchal to General. 2. They willingly grant, That any

any particular Church, or Provincial or National Synod may lawfully make Definitions in matters of Faith, Reformations of Errors and Manners, and other Ecclesiastical Constitutions for it self, without the concurrence or conjuncture at the same time of any other Church or Synod therewith. But 3^{ly}, They deny, that any particular Church, or Provincial, or National Synod, may make such Determinations or Constitutions contrary to those of any present, or former Authority, or Synod, (or maintain them made contrary to such Synod present or future reversing them) to which Authority either Divine or Ecclesiastical Constitution hath made them Subordinate. For, without destroying Government, no Ecclesiastical Law can be dissolved but by the same, or an equal Power to that, which made it; nor can a part, (suppose a Church, *Arian* or *Donatist*), as it thinketh meet, from time to time, see it self from the Acts of the whole; especially in such things, wherein it can shew in it self no particular difference, or disparity from the rest of the whole. And therefore 4^{ly}, They affirm that when Ecclesiastical Persons, or Synods, happen to oppose one another, Christian Obedience is still due only to the Superior; whom ever it to whomsoever he belongs, in his own *Constituted* *Government*.

H E A D . V I I .*Concerning Ecclesiastical Supremacy.**Concerning Ecclesiastical Supremacy.*

1. **T**HE Catholick Church here on Earth is but one united State and Body (which all seem to confess, in that when any separation is made, every side endeavours to remove the cause thereof from themselves.) And it cannot reasonably be denied, that All the Christian Churches in the world are capable of a Monarchical Government under one Bishop, as well as several Nations under one Emperor, or Secular Prince; and that such Government much conduceth to the Church's Peace, and to the preventing and suppression of Heresies and Schisms. 2. Catholicks persuaded therein both by the Scriptures, and Tradition do acknowledge;

1. That

H E A D . VII.

1. That St. Peter was made by Christ President and Head of the College of the Apostles, *Matt. 16. 19. 20. 21. 15.* being compared with *Gal. 2. 7.* And 2dly, That the Bishop of *Rome* is his Successor in such Supremacy; as likewise Successor to St. Paul the Great Apostle of the Gentiles; in that See where in the two great Apostles last resided, anciently called *etiam Sedes Apostolica*: And 3dly, That this Bishop hath by Divine Right, or if it were only by Ecclesiastical Constitution, and by ancient Tradition and Custom, it were sufficient, committed to him a Supreme Authority over the Universal Church of Christ here on Earth, in the calling of Councils and in the approving, and confirming their Definitions, before they can be universally obligatory; and in taking care in the Intervals of such Councils, of the due execution and observance of their Decrees; and in receiving Appeals from all parts of the Church in some matters of greater concernment. And 4th, That, as no temporal Power may lawfully change, or annul any Ecclesiastical Constitutions, or Decrees made concerning the Government of the Church, or other matters merely Spiritual; so neither may such temporal Power in particular abrogate this Ecclesiastical Authority, tho' it were only conferred on the Bishop of *Rome* by the Church, so far as using a Jurisdiction merely Spiritual in Matters that are so. 5th, They willingly confess; That the Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority cannot dispense with any Divine Law now (without such Dispensation) obliging; but only with Ecclesiastical Laws: Nor hath any Power over Princes, or their Subjects in Temporal matters; but only in Spiritual of the Church. 6th, That there is no Decree of the Church or Council obliging any to maintain this Supreme Magistrate of the Church to be infallible in his Decrees; nor on the other side just cause for any therefore to withdraw their obedience to his Decrees because they hold him not infallible.

H E A D .

H E A D . V I I I .

Lastly, Concerning the necessary Amplitude of a lawfull General Council,

Concerning the necessary Amplitude of a lawfull General Council.

In which the Supreme Judgment of this united Body is placed.

1. It is not necessary to the composition of a lawful General Council that all the Clergy of the Christian world be assembled therein; or all the Bishops of this Clergy, or amongst the Bishops, some sent thither (the Delegates by the rest) from all particular Churches professing Christianity. For upon these terms, the four first Councils cannot be allowed General. Again; Thus it would be in the power of any particular Church, in detaining its Bishops, to hinder the Being, and the Benefit of a General Council. Again, Heretical or Schismatical Churches being no part of the Church Catholick, the absence of their Bishops hinders not, but that the representative of the Church Catholick in such Council may be still compleat.

2. The Presence of the Delegated Bishops of all particular Catholick Churches, or Provinces, is not necessary in such Council to denominate it lawfully General; (it being provided, that all are called to it, and none that come, excluded;) Because this Absence of some may either be necessitated, from Poverty, distance of Place, Lets of temporal Magistrate; or voluntary also, out of some unlawful respect. Which Absence of some few in comparison of the whole, if it can hinder the necessary Generality of the Council, it is probable, that there will never want, within the Confines also of the Church Catholick, now spread thro the Dominions of several Princes of contrary interests, some either Bishops or Secular Governours that are averse from the meeting of such Council in respect of some Circumstances belonging to it; at least those of time, place, &c.

3. For these reasons therefore; such Council seems to be unquestion-

unquestionably General (not to say here, that none less than such can justly be so) where are present in person or by his Legates, the Bishop of the Prime Apostolick See; (without whom no such Council can be held) and by their Lieutenant's at least, all or most of the other Patriarchs, such as are in Being, and have some considerable part of the Church Catholick subjected unto them; [It is said most of them; for the presence and concurrence of all of them was not thought necessary neither in the third nor fourth of the allowed General Councils.] And the Representatives of a considerably major part of the Catholick Provinces; and more especially the Representatives of the largest and most dignified of these Provinces.

In the Absence of some Patriarchs, or chief Churches in such Council, or in the presence there only of a smaller number of Delegates from the greater, and more numerous Provinces, and of a greater number from other less (as five or six Bishops only delegated from the Western Churches were present in the Council of *Nice*); or in any other deficiency of the representement of the greatest part of the Church Catholick in this Assembly; yet when the Decrees, and Acts of such smaller part being sent and made known to the Absent, are both confirmed by the Bishop of *Rome* the Primate of the Patriarchs, and of the universal Church, and accepted also by the much major part of the Catholick Provinces, tho' these be not accepted by some others of them, such Council ought either to be received as General, or as equivalent thereto, and the Acts therof are obligatory to the whole Church Catholick. For seeing that if all the Provinces had convened in one Place and Body, the disagreeing votes of some Provinces in such Councils being fewer, and lesser could not have justly hindered, but that the contrary votes of the other much major part would have stood in force and obliged all to obedience, then neither can their dissent out of the Council be rationally pretended to hinder the same. And what engagement the several Provinces of the present Age have to such Council, the same also all future seem to have for the same reason till an equal Authority to that which established such Ecclesiastical laws reverse them (which in matters of necessary Faith will never happen.) So the Arian Churches of the fifth Age

Catholick THESES.

are in much obliged to the Definitions of the *Nicene Council* as those of the fourth: And in any Age what means can there be of Preservation of Unity for matter of Faith in the Church Catholick, if a few, in comparison, will neither be regulated by any one Person at Head; Nor yet concluded by the much major part? Here by *acceptation of the said major part* of Catholick Provinces is understood none other necessary, than only a peaceful acquiescence in, and conformity to the Decrees of such Councils; and a non declaring against them, tho' such Acceptation proceed not so far, as to the passing of an Act to that effect in Provincial or National Synods. For, this last hath not been done to those *Acta of Councils* universally held General.

To go yet a little further. Considering the present Condition both of the Eastern Churches, and of such Patriarchs, as are yet left (besides the Roman); such now richer in numbers, than in power, the paucity, poverty, and littleness (intervening by their great oppressions) of their Clergy, their incapacity to assemble themselves even in lesser Synods for consultation (to say nothing here whether any of those Churches have declined from the former Definitions of the Church Catholick, and so are become heretical); and so incapable of sitting in Ecclesiastical Synods; in these times a General Council such as ought to oblige may be well apprehended to receive narrower bounds than formerly. And such a Council, where those who are Catholick in Eastern Churches, are washed for, invited, and if any come, are excluded; and in which all the Western Provinces yet flourishing in Religion, and not obstructed from meeting, are called, and in which the Representatives of the greatest part of them, joined with the Prime Patriarch are assembled; such Council I say, ought either to receive the denomination of General (especially as to these Doctrines wherein the Eastern Churches consent) or of the most General that the present times will afford; or at least of a Patriarchal and lawful Superior Council: and so in the same measure accepted obligeth all the Provinces of the West to yield obedience thereto; and therefore in such an Age, for any Person or Church, that is a Member of this Western Body, to call for a larger Council than can be had, is only an Arifice

to decline Judgment, and for any to Appeal to a future Council, which can be no larger than that past, to whose sentence they deny Submission, what is this but to renounce the Authority they appeal to? To which may be added that any Appeal to a future Council concerning such Controversies, where in one knoweth the unanimous Doctrine of the much major part of the present Christian Churches, as well Eastern as Western, to be against him, seeme bootless and affording no relief. Because such Council can consist only of the Governors, and so of the judgments of such particular Churches is of the major part of these Christian Churches, and of the several Bishops presiding in them, especially now after the cause, reasons, pretended demonstrations, of the dissenting Party for so many years, divulg'd, pleaded, consider'd; such we may presume will be that of the Council: For what can effect a Mutation of opinion in these Persons joined, which alreath nothing now, in them sever'd?

Concerning the Unity of the Church, and of its Government, and Succession, in respect of Seculars.

§. I.

Catholicks affirm: That the Church and Civil Societies are two distinct Bodies, subject to their distinct Superiors, and that the Church Catholick is but one in many the Unity of States.

Again: That the Civil State, entring into the Body of the Church, cannot thereby justly take from it any of its former Rights, which are instated upon it by our Lord; and which and Succession it did, or might justly exercise in such Civil State, before this State submitted it self to the Christian Faith: Nor yet the Church, entring into any State, take away any of the Civil Rights, or Authority, thereof; which is given to the Government of this State by God; and which it was justly possessed

Catholic THESES.

of, before the Church entered into it. Takes away, I say, none of these Rights, where Persons or Things, formerly Civil, do not, by their Dedication to God, become Sacred. Not the Church callenge any Temporal Right or Authority, as to the use of the Secular Sword, which the State doth not first invest it with. And, That, therefore, these two Bodies may always without any jealousy, most peaceably confit together; Because the Principles of Christianity do most entirely secure and preserve all the Secular Rights of Princes. And, because in leaving only to Princes the use of the Temporal Sword, the Church can never, in any difference that happens, be the invading, but only the suffering Party.

§. 2.

2. Therefore, 2dly, in consequence hereof, They hold, That the Subordinations of Ecclesiastical Government, such as are necessary for the exclusion of Heresies, and Schismas, and conservation of the Churches Unity, Uniformity, and Peace, throughout several Nations; And those which are instituted by Christ, or his Apostles; or are afterward established in the Church-Catholick by Ecclesiastical Canons, made by the chief Representative thereof. (I mean, such Canons, as can no way be justly pretended to do any wrong to the Civil Government) They hold, That such Subordinations of Church-Government cannot justly be changed; nor the observance of such Constitutions be abrogated, or prohibited by any Secular Supreme Christian or Heathen, within their own Dominions.

§. 3.

3. Since it is clear, That Christ sent his Ministers to preach the Gospel, and do other meerly Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Offices in all Nations; and in those Nations too, then, as now, under some Supreme Civil Governor; which Offices also those Ministers did accordingly perform for three hundred years, tho' the said Governors prohibited and oppoſed them. So, for Example, the Apostles, and other Church-Governors, in those times assembled themselves in a Council at *Jerusalem* to consult and give orders throughout the Churches concerning the Abrogation of former Legal Ceremonies. So St. Paul in those times gave Commission to *Timothy* for the govern-

HEAD. IX.

17

governing of the Christian Church in *Ephesus*; to *Titus* for the governing those in *Creet*; to ordain Clergy thro the Cities there; and in these Provinces to receive Accusations; hear Witnesses; promulgate the Doctrines formerly received; silence False-teachers; excommunicate Offenders, &c. 1. *Tim.* 1. 3. — 5. 19. 2. *Tim.* 2. 2. *Tit.* 1. 5. 21. — 3. 10. And so he gave order also to them to hold publick Assemblies, 1. *Cor.* 5. 4. *Heb.* 10. 25. for the common Worship of God, and for the exercising of the forenamed Acts. And so the Successors of these first Church Governors also used the same authority for those three first Centuries in all dominions distributed into several Provincial and Parochial [or Diocesan] Governments, tho the Secular Powers frequently resisted, imprisoned, executed the Church Officers for it. These things therefore thus granted and allowed, hence they infer, that as a Heathen Prince cannot justly prohibit all Christian Clergy; so neither can a Christian Prince, amongst this Clergy, justly prohibit all those, whom only these Ecclesiastical Magistrates do judge Orthodox, and worthy, from professing, and publishing the Orthodox Faith, and otherwise officiating in Divine matters within his Dominions. Else, as where the Prince is Heathen, Christianity cannot be propagated in his Territories against *Infidelity*; so where the Christian Prince happens to be Heretical, (suppose an Arian, as the Emperour *Constantius* was) the Truth of Christianity cannot be preserved in his dominions against *Heresy*; or where he Schismatical, the Unity of the Churches Communion cannot be preferred against the *Sects*, in his dominion. For Confirmation of these three precedent *Theses* see at large the Protestant Concessions in letter 4. To which is annexed an Answer to all their Pleas and Defences made by them for a lawful Reformation of Ecclesiastical Persons and Matters by the Secular Power.

§. 4

4. Consequently to the Precedents: seeing that, as there are many *temporal* Jurisdictions descending on the Church; originally from the Secular Power, so there are also other *spiritual* Jurisdictions, primitively belonging to, and exercised by, the Church; and held from the donation of our Lord,

Catholick THESES.

Lord, such as the aforementioned, [viz. 'To hold publick Religious Assemblies; to promulgate the Doctrines formerly delivered; to administer the Sacraments of the Church; to receive Accusations; hear Witnesses; in point of Heresy and Schism to bind, absolve; to silence False-teachers; & communicate oblate Offenders; and that in all Nations, and within any Princes Dominions, whatever.']. They accordingly affirm. 1. That no Secular Power can bestow, or derive their spiritual Jurisdictions on any person, but that to be in such dominions by any person lawfully executed there must first be conferred on him by the Clergy. 2dly. That the act only, of some *inferior* Clergy against their Canonical Superiors, or of the *minor* part of Clergy against the major can be no legitimate act of the Clergy, for conferring such spiritual Jurisdictions; but the contrary to it.

¶ And hence, say, They gather; That, the Princes, for the greater security of their Civil Government, and the many secular obligations which the Church hath to them, may nominate, and present to the Clergy and Ecclesiastical Magistrates such persons, as they think most meet to receive from the Church these spiritual Jurisdictions within their dominions: yet, if any Secular Power should possess such person of these Jurisdictions in any Province either by his own sole authority, or by the concurrence of some inferior Clergy, or minor part of such Province, whom the major part of the Clergy of such Province, or the due Ecclesiastical Superiors (to whom according to Church Canons the conferring of such Jurisdiction doth belong) to judge incapable or unfit; and therefore refuse the collation of them on such a subject. They affirm such an Act of the Prince, or Clergy assisting him, to be unlawful; and that it must needs open a way to all Heresy and Schism, and dissolve the Faith, and Unity of the Church Catholick. Neither, can any such Person so introduced, tho he be validly ordained, justly exercise such spiritual Jurisdictions; neither do all such people, as know, receive any salutiful benefit by his unlawful administration to them of the Church's Sacraments, or, at least, of the Sacrament of Penance, and Absolution, by reason of a defect of right.

THE A.D. 1415.

right disposition in the Suspects, and the great gileflecy contract in applying themselves to such a Perion: unless this be done in a case of necessity, when there is no Catholick Clergy to repair to for such Offices. So had *Nicatianus*, aduised and adhered to by three, or four Bishops, been upon this sealed by a Christian Emperor in the Apostolick Chair against *Cornelius*, ordained and confirmed in these Jurisdictions by all the rest of the Body of the Roman Episcopal Clergy; yet *Nicatianus* would, no less for this, have been still a Schismatique and an Usurper.

6. Hence also, should a Christian Secular Power (suppose, Arius) refest to nominate, and present any person to the Clergy to be admitted to such Office and Jurisdictions within his dominions, save such as are Arians, here the Church-Governors, authorized by the Canons, ought to take the same care for these Christian Provinces in such dominions in the times of Christian, as they did in times of Heathen Princes; in appointing such other Pastors over the Flocks of Christ there, as will still preserve the Faith and Unity of the Catholick Church. And, should the Church-Governors *des�re* appoint him, because they see the possession of such place is by violence hindred; yet will he, who, in the manner aforesaid, invades such office, be as much an Usurper, as if he entered upon a Chair already possessed; when it is only by reason of him, and such like, that those men are kept out, who might rightly possesse it; and it is to be reckoned the same delinquency, as if such Chair had actually two Bishops.

7. They hold, That, to the Exercise of the Episcopal Functions (in any Province) so, that it may continue undivided from the Unity of the Church-Catholick; and so, that the Subjects of such Province may receive any benefit thereby, two things are required according to the ancient Laws of the Church, made for preserving Unity for ever. 1. Three Bishops to confer the Order; or, in some dispensable cases, one ablest. 2. The Consent, at least non-opposition, of the major part of the Bishops of the same Province to such Ordination, and the Licence or Confirmation of the Metropolitan (or yet

S. 6.

S. 7.

yet higher, of the Patriarch himself; & it mattering little as to preserving the Church's Unity, so long as the Metropolitans, and their actions, are subjected to their Patriarch, whether one, or both, or the higher, without the lower, do ratify the Election of the Bishops.) So that any Ordination made by three or four Bishops of a Person wanting the foresaid Consent and Confirmation from Superiors, tho' it be valid, the Order is frustrate, from any Jurisdiction, or lawful exercise thereof (in the same manner, as that of a true Bishop is frustrate when afterwards he is justly excommunicated) as being given, and received, out of the Unity of the Church Catholick; and as exposing the Church to all the divisions and factions, which the Lusts of two or three Ecclesiasticks, assisted with a Secular Power seduced, may please to set up.

§. 8.

8. It seems evident from Antiquity, as likewise confessed by learned Protestants; that, as the Bishops could not exercise, in any Diocese, a lawful Spiritual Jurisdiction, without the Metropolitans Licence, and Confirmation; so neither could the Metropolitan, in any Province, without that of the Patriarch. There seeming as great reason, and necessity of this, for preserving the Unity of the Church Catholick amongt the Metropolitans, and Primates in the several Provinces thereof, as amongst Bishops in the several Diocesses. And therefore, anciently these Metropolitans obtained also the consent of their Co-Metropolitans in other Provinces, by the *Litterae Communicatorie*, or *formatæ* of those Bishops, upon the sending to them a Copy of their Faith (according as it was settled, and professed in the several Articles thereof, exclusively to Heresies in those present times) and a Testimonial of their legitimate Election. Which also may be said of the Patriarchs themselves; who upon their sending the like Confessions and Informations, received a Confirmation from the Primate of them, the Roman Bishop, and the other Co-Patriarchs.

§. 9.

9. As for the Supreme Bishop of the Catholick Church, who, therefore could not receive this his Authority and Jurisdiction from any Superior; yet anciently neither was he con-

conceived to have any lawful Jurisdiction, unless possessed thereof by the designation, and suffrage of the major part at least of the Clergy, and Bishops of the Roman Province (in later times, for peace sake, transferred upon the Cardinals.) To which was usually added also the Communicatory Letters of other Patriarchs and Primates, upon his professing to them if, need were, the Catholick Faith of his Ancestors, and the legalacts of his Election. And if, in latter times, the manner of his Investiture with this Supreme Authority, and Jurisdiction be not altogether the same; yet since we had in all ages a major part of Christian Churches (such as are guilty of no ancient condemned Heresy) adhering to the Roman, Bishop, and Faith, wheras, meanwhile, several of the other Patriarchs have been condemned for Hereticks; we may presume also, that not only the Clergy of the Roman Province, but all, or at least a major part of, the Governors of these Churches are and have been, from age to age, ready to afford the same Testimony to his just, and Canonical Authority. And these seem to be the necessary Foundations and Pillars that support the Unity of the Church Catholick.

a. Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. v. 1. 3. c. Ex Scripturis videlicet habemus nisi das Pontificis claves regni celorum: de clavibus regni terrarum nulla mentia fit, Traditio Apostolica nulla. Quando Rex sit Christianus, non perdit regnum terrarum quod jam obtinebat. (Suitable to the Church Hymn, Crudelis Herodes Deum Regem venit quid times i. Non eripit Mortalium, &c.) And the same Cardinal quoting a Passage out of an Epistle of Pope Nicholaus. Quicquid (saith he) Imperatores habent, dicit Nicolaus, a Christo eos habere. Peto igitur; vel potest summus Pontifex auferre a Regibus & Imperatoribus hoc, tanquam Summus ipse Rex, & Imperator, aut non potest? Si potest, ergo est maior Christus, si non potest, ergo non habet vere potestem regiam. Neither is any such power in Temporals absolutely necessary to the Church in order to Spirituals, without the exercise of which power the primitive Church, tho' most grievously oppressed by Secular States, yet enjoyed this Government in Spirituals perfect and entire.

And concerning the Obligation of the Clergy, also, the sequestred

Catholick THESES.

22

uestred to God's Service, to the obedience of the Civil Laws of Princes, together with their other Fellow Subjects: Thus the same Cardinal, *De Clericis*, i. l. 28. c. *Clerici, pratorquam quid Clerici sunt, sunt etiam Civis & Partes quedam Republicae politicae: igitur ut tales vivere debent civilibus legibus, non sunt autem alio, ut nunc ponimus, nisi que a Politico Magistratu sunt latit; igitur illas Clericos servare debent, atque magna perturbatio & confusio in Republica oriretur &c.* quoting St. Chrysostome in 13. ad Rom. *Christi Exemplio non tolli politicus leges, videlicet debere etiam Sacerdotes & Monachos eis parere:* and parere not only in a directive, but coercitive way, not only to be guided in their duty by the laws, but forced to obedience of it. But this Coalition to proceed not from the Civil, but Ecclesiastical Magistrate to whom the Civil in honour to the Clergy hath remitted it, till in case of hainous Crimes after degradation from the Sacerdotal Dignity, they are returned to the Secular Justice.

8.
§. II.

See Canon Apostol. 35. *Episcopos gentium singularum sicut convenient, quis inter eos primus habeatur: quem velut caput consilium, & nihil amplius preter ejus conscientiam gerant, quam illa sola singuli, que parochia propria & villis, que sub ea sunt, competitum.* Sed nec ille preter omnium conscientiam facias unquid in eorum parochiis. Sic enim unanimitas erit.

Concil. Nicen. Can. 4. *Episcopum circuin maxime quidem ab omnibus, qui sunt in Provincia Episcopis ordinari. Si autem hoc difficile fuerit aut properius instantem necessitatem, aus propter tenuis longitudinem, tribus Iudicis omnimodis in edipsum convenientibus, & absentibus quoque pari modo discernendibus, & per scripta conscientibus, tunc ordinatio celebretur. Firmitas autem eorum, quo geruntur per unumquaque Provinciam Metropolitano tribuantur Episcopo.* Can. 5. *De his qui Communionem precantur seu ex clero seu ex laico, ordine ab Episcopo per unumquaque Provinciam, sententia regularis obtinetur, ut si qui absidentibus ab aliis non recipiantur.*

Can. 6. *Antiqua consuetudo servetur per Egyptum, Lybiam, & Pentapolim, ita ut Alexandrinus Episcopus dorum omnium habeat potestatem; quia & urbis Romae Episcopo parvus mos est: Similiter autem & apud Antiochiam, ceteraque Provincias suis*

suis privilegiis serventur Ecclesiis: illud autem generaliter charum est, quod si quis propter sententiam Metropolitani fuerit factus Episcopus hunc magna Synodus definitus Episcopum esse non oportere. Sin eam communis cunctorum Decreto rationabiliter secundum Ecclesiasticam Regulari comprobato, dimittit tres proprietas contentiones proprias contradicunt, utimur sententias plurimorum.

I may spare the recital of any more, tho' the same is frequently iterated in the following Councils. See Conc. Laudic. c. 12. 2. Conc. Arles. c. 5. 2. Garth. c. 12. Rbegiense, c. 1. Cahiliac. c. 10. Epist. Synodal, Conc. Romani sub Siricio Papa, c. 1. and see what is said of this matter in Considerations on the Council of Trent, c. 10. &c. See likewise the Cautions used by the Council of Trent, Sess. 24. De Reform. c. 1. And Sess. 22. De Reform. c. 2. concerning the approbation of such persons as are nominated for Bishopricks by other Ecclesiastical Superiors, and so the Collation of these Preferments upon them by the Pope.

This Confirmation of all Ordinations by their Ecclesiastical Superiors for preserving the Churches Unity, is freely acknowledged by Mr. Thorneike in his Book of the Rights of the Church, s. c. p. 248. Where he mentions also some of the former Canons. 'The fourth Canon (saith he) of the Council of Nice, requireth that all Bishops be ordained by a Council of the Bishops of the Province [suffici potest], which Council because it cannot always be had, therefore it is provided, [there] That two or three may do the work the rest consenting and authorizing the Proceeding. And this is that which the ordinance of the Apostles hath provided to keep the visible Communion of the whole Church in Unity. But when among the Bishops of any Province, part consent to Ordination, part not; the Unity of the Church cannot be preserved unless the consent of the whole follow the consent of the greater part. And therefore It seemeth that there can no valid Ordination be made, where the greater number of the Bishops of the Province dissent; which is confirmed by the Ordination of Novatianus for Bishop of Rome: which tho' done by three Bishops, yet was the foundation of that great Schisme, because Cornelius was ordained on the other side by sixteen.

After which in Application of these things to the Ordinations, made in the Church *England* at the Reformation, he hath this Reflection, *Ibid.* p. 250. ‘Now it is manifest (faith ‘he) that the Ordinations by which that Order (of Bishops) ‘is propagated in *England* at, and since, the Reformation, ‘were not made by content of the greater part of the Bishops of ‘each Province, but against their mind tho they made no con-‘trary Ordinations. And by the same means it is manifest, ‘that all those Ecclesiastical Laws, by which the Reforma-‘tion was established in *England* [i.e. by these new Bishops] ‘were not made by a content capable to oblige the Church, ‘if we set aside the Secular Power that gave force unto that ‘which was done [by the Bishops] contrary to that Rule ‘wherein the Unity of the Church consisteth. But in other ‘parts the Reformation was so far from being done by Bishops ‘and Presbyters, or any consent which was able to con-‘clude the Church, by the constitution of the Church, that ‘the very Order of Bishops is laid aside and forgot, if not ‘worse; i.e. detested among them. Upon which precedent ‘it sounds plausibly with the greatest part among us: that ‘the Unity of the whole being [thus] dissolved by the ‘Reformation [i.e. by the Reformers either being against ‘Bishops, or being Bishops made against the consent of the ‘former Bishops] the Unity of the Reformation cannot be ‘preserved, but by dissolving the Order of Bishops among us. The like he saith before, p. 248. ‘If the Clergy of that time ‘[i.e. in the beginning of Qu. Elizabeth’s Reformation] had ‘been supported in that Power which by the Premises [set ‘down and justified in his Book] is challenged on behalf of ‘the Clergy, this Reformation could not have been brought ‘to pass.

Yet notwithstanding this Learned man thinks himself still secure in that Communion, by imagining first that the Apostolical Succession of the governing Clergy, which Canonically concludes the whole, hath in several things violated Christ’s Laws [but, quo *Indice* will any such thing be cleared, See below, §. 37.] And 2dly, that in any such case the Secular Power may oppose their Authority, tho this established by the Apostles, viz. So often as either the Apostles Ordinance

mance or Christ's Laws must necessarily one of them be infringed.

y. See Conc. Nicen. c. 6. Conc. Chalced. a. 28. And Act 16.
 —8. Gen. Conc. c. 10. 17. 21. Where (in c. 17.) is mentioned the 6th Canon of the Nicene Council, and thus explained. *Quia pro causa & hac magna & sancta Synodus tam in seniori, & nova Roma [Constantinopoli] quam in sede Antiochiae & Hierosolymorum, priscam consuetudinem decernit in omnibus conservari; ita ut earum Presules universorum Metropolitarum, qui ab ipsis promoventur, & sive per manus impositionem, sive per Pallii dationem, Episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiant, habeant potestatem; viz. ad concordandum eos, urgente necessitate, ad Synodalem Conventum: vel etiam ad coercendum illos & corrigendum, cum fama eos super quibusdam delictis forsitan accusaverit.*

Of which Canon thus Dr. Field, p. 518. "Patriarchs were by the Order of the 8th General Council, Can. 17. to confirm the Metropolitans subject unto them either by the imposition of hands or giving the Pall. And l. 3. c. 37. p. 351. "Without the Patriarchs consent none of the Metropolitans subject unto them, might be ordained. And what they bring (saith he) proves nothing that we ever doubted of; For we know the Bishop of Rome hath the right of confirming the Metropolitans within the Precincts of his own Patriarchship, as likewise every other Patriarch had. And thus Bishop Brambal, (Vindic. c. 9. p. 259. &c.) "What power the Metropolitan had over the Bishops of his own Province, the same had a Patriarch over the Metropolitans, and Bishops of sundry Provinces within his own Patriarchate. And afterwards, Wherein then consisteth Patriarchal Authority? In ordaining their Metropolitans, or confirming them."

J. Bishop Carleton in his Treatise of Jurisdiction Regal and Episcopal, 4. c. p. 42. "External Jurisdiction is either definitive or multative. Authority definitive in matters of Faith and Religion belongeth to the Church. Multative power is understood either as it is with coaction [i. e. using Secular force] or as it is referred to Spiritual Censures. As it standeth

§. 13.

§. 14.

Catholic THESES.

'eth in Spiritual Censures it is the right of the Church, and was practised by the Church when without Christian Magistrate, and since. But coactive Jurisdiction was always understood to belong to the Civil Magistrate, whether Christian or Heathen.

Ibid. 1. c. p. 9. 'As for Spiritual Jurisdiction standing in Examination of Controversies of Faith, judging of Hereticks, deposing of Hereticks, Excommunications of notorious and stubborn offenders, Ordination of Priests and Deacons; Institution and Collation of Benefices, and Spiritual Cures thus we reserve entire to the Church; which Princes cannot give to, nor take from, the Church.'

And by this Power (saith he, 4. c. p. 39.) without Co-action, the Church was called, Faith was planted, Devils were subdued, the Nations were taken out of the power of darkness, the world reduced to the obedience of Christ; by this Power, without coactive Jurisdiction, the Church was governed for 300 years together. But if it be enquired what was done when the Emperors were Christian; and when their coactive Power came in?] 'The Emperors (saith he, p. 178.) never took upon them by their Authority to define matters of Faith and Religion, that they left to the Church: But when the Church had defined such Truths against Hereticks, and had deposed such Hereticks; then the Emperors concurring with the Church by their Imperial Constitutions, did by their coactive Power give strength to the Canon of the Church,

§. 15.

Mr. Thorndike (*Rights of the Church*, 4. c. p. 234.) 'The Power of the Church is so absolute and depending on God alone, that if a Sovereign professing Christianity should forbid the profession of that Faith, or the Exercise of those Ordinances which God hath required to be served with [The judgment of which Faith and Ordinances what they are, Protestants also affirm to belong to the Clergy] or even the Exercise of that Ecclesiastical Power which shall be necessary to serve the Unity of the Church, it must needs be necessary for those, that are trusted with the Power of the Church, not only to disobey the Commands of the Sovereign, but to use that

that Power, which their Quality in the Society of the Church gives them to provide for the subsistence thereof without the assistance of Secular Powers. A thing manifestly supposed by all the Bishops of the ancient Church in all those actions, wherein they refused to obey their Emperors seduced by Hereticks [refused to obey them in forbearing to teach still, and publish the Catholick Doctrine, when prohibited by them] and to suffer their Churches to be regulated by them, to the prejudice of Christianity. Which actions whosoever justifies not, he will lay the Church open to ruine, whensoever the Sovereign Power is seduced by Hereticks. And such a difference falling out [i.e. between Prince and Clergy in Church matters] as that to particular persons it cannot be clear who is in the right; It will be requisite (faith he) for Christians in a doubtful case, at their utmost perils to adhere to the Guides of the Church against their lawful Sovereign, tho to no other effect, than to suffer [if the Prince impole it] for the Exercise of their Christianity, and the maintenance of the Society of the Church in Unity. See the same Author, *Epihg. I. l. 19. c.* The contents whereof touching this subject, he hath briefly expressed thus. That that Power which was in the Churches under the Apostles can never be in any Christian Sovereign. That the interest of Secular Power, in determining matters of Faith, presupposeth the Society of the Church, and the Act of it. And there he giveth reasons why the Church is to decide matters of Faith, rather than the State; supposing he, who disturbs the Communion of the Church, remains punishable by the Secular power (to inflict temporal penalties) not absolutely because it is Christian; but upon supposition that this temporal power maintaineth the true Church. And afterward. That the Secular Power is not able of it self to do any of those Acts, which the Church [i.e. those who are qualified by, and for the Church) are qualified by virtue of their Communion from Christ to do, without committing the sin of Sacrilege (in seizing into its own hands the Powers, which by God's Act, are constituted and therefore consecrated and dedicated to his own service) not supposing

‘posing the free Act of the Church, without fraud and violence [concurring] to the doing of it. Now among the Acts, and Powers belonging to the Church (which he calls a Corporation) by divine right and appointment; he names these 1. l. 16. c. p. 116. The Power of making Laws within themselves [and them, I suppose of publishing them (made) among all the Subjects of the Church in whatever Princes Dominions; else why make them?] of electing Church Governors (of which see 3. l. 32. c. p. 398.) and of Excommunicating, and (3. l. 32. c. p. 385.) The Power to determine all matters, the determination whereof is requisite to maintain the Communion of Christians in the service of God: and [the Power] to oblige Christians to stand to that determination under pain of forfeiting that Communion. The Power of holding Assemblies [which must be by meeting together in some place or other, and by some Church Authority calling them]. Of which he speaks thus, 1. l. 8. c. p. 53. ‘I must not omit to alledge the Authority of Councils, and to maintain the Right and Power of holding them, and the obligation, which the Decrees of them, regularly made, is able to create, to stand by the same Authority of the Apostles.

And afterward, ‘I, that pretend the Church to be a Corporation founded by God upon a Priviledge of holding visible Assemblies for the common Service of God, notwithstanding any secular force prohibiting the same, must needs maintain by consequence that the Church hath Power in itself to hold all such Assemblies as shall be requisite to maintain the common Service of God and the Unity in it, and the order of all Assemblies that exercise it. Thus Mr. Thorndike.

S. 16.

Dr. Taylor in Episcopacy asserted (published by the Kings Authority) after that (p. 236.) he hath laid this ground for the security of Secular Princes; That since that Christ hath professed that his Kingdome is not of this world, that Government which he hath constituted *de novo* doth no way make any Entrenchment on the Royalty, hath these Passages, p. 237. he saith, ‘That those things which Christianity (as it prescinds from the interest of the Republick) hath introduced, all them and all the causes emergent from them, the Bishop is Judge

Judge of. Such are causes of Faith ; ministratio[n] of Sacra-
ments and Sacramentals, Subordination of inferiour Clergy
to their Superiours, Rites, Liturgies, &c. As for the Rights
of the Secular Power he layeth down this Rule, p. 236.
‘ Wharsoeuer the Secular T[ri]bunal did take Cognizance of,
before it was Christian, the same it takes notice of, after
it is Christened. And these are, all Actions civil, all pub-
lick Visitations of Justice, all breach of municipal Laws.
These the Church (saith he) hath nothing to do with, un-
less by the favour of Princes these be indulged to it [these
by their favour then, indulged, but not so the former.] Ac-
cordingly, p. 239. he saith, ‘ Both Prince and Bish[ops] have
indicted Synods, in several ages, upon the exigence of se-
veral occasions, and have several Powers for the engage-
ments of clerical obedience and attendance upon such So-
lemnities. That the Bish[ops] Jurisdiction hath a Compul-
sory, derived from Christ only, viz. Inflictions of Censures
by Excommunications, or other *minores plaga*, which are in
order to it. And that the King is supreme of the Jurisdicti-
on, viz. that part of it, which is the external Compulsory
[i.e. as he saith before] to superadd a temporal penalty upon
Contumacy, or some other way abet the Censures of the
Church. P. 243. he saith, That in those cases in which by
the law of Christ Bish[ops] may, or in which they must use,
Excommunication, no Power can forbid them. For what
power Christ hath given them, no man can take away. And
p. 244. That the Church may inflict her Censures upon her
Delinquent Children without asking leave ; that Christ is
her *auditor* for that, he is her warrant and security. And
p. 245. That the King’s supreme Regal Power, in causes of
the Church consists in all things, in which the Priestly office
is not precisely by God’s law, employed for regiment and
care of Souls [I suppose those he named before, p. 237.] and
in these also, that all the external Compulsory and Juris-
diction [as he expoundeth before, p. 239.] is the King’s.
And lastly, p. 241. he saith, ‘ That the Catholick Bish[ops]
[in time of Arian Emperors] made humble and fair remon-
strance of the distinction of Powers and Jurisdiction ; that
as they might not intrench upon the Royalty, so neither be-

Catholick THESES.

30

'tray the right, which Christ had concredited to them to the
encroachment of an exterior Jurisdiction and Power [i.e.
the Royal.]

§ 17.

Bishop Bramhall frequently stateth the Primacy or Supremacy of Princes in Ecclesiastical matters thus. *Schisme Guarded*, p. 61. he saith. 'All that our Kings assume to themselves is the external Regiment of the Church by coactive Power, to be exercised by persons capable of the respective branches of it.' And p. 63, quoting the 37 Article of the Church of England, where the King's Supremacy is expressed thus. 'To preserve or contain all Estates and Orders committed to their trust, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in their duties, and restrain contumacious offenders with the Civil Sword [in which restraining offenders, and containing all in their duty with the Civil Sword, the Prince is willingly acknowledged by Catholicks the, and the only Supreme] he comments thus upon it. 'You see the Power is Political, the Sword is Political, all is Political; our Kings leave the Power of the Keys, and Jurisdiction Spiritual, purely to those to whom Christ hath left them.' And in answere to another Passage in the 37th Article, and also in the Oath of Supremacy, wherein the Bishop of Rome is denied to have any Jurisdiction in the Kingdome of England; he distinguisheth between a jurisdiction, (suppose to excommunicate, absolve, degrade) purely Spiritual governing Christians in the interior Court of Conscience, and extending no further, and an exterior coactive jurisdiction exercised in the exterior Ecclesiastical Courts; the exterior Coaction of which, he saith, is originally Political, and so belonging only to, and held from, the Prince. His words are, *Schisme Guarded*, p. 160. 'Our Ancestors [in denying any Jurisdiction that is Patriarchal to the Pope] meant the very lame thing that we do: our only difference is in the use of the words, *Spiritual Authority* or *Jurisdiction*, which we understand properly of Jurisdiction purely Spiritual, which extends no further then the Court of Conscience: But by *Spiritual Authority* or *Jurisdiction* they did understand Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the exterior Court, which, in truth is partly Spiritual, partly Political.'

The

'The interior habit, which enableth an Ecclesiastical Judge to excommunicate or absolve, or degrade, is merely Spiritual; but the exterior Coaction is originally Political. So our Ancestors cast out external Ecclesiastical coercive Jurisdiction; the same do we; They did not take away from the Pope the power of the Keys, or Jurisdiction purely Spiritual; no more do we. And *Ibid.* p. 119. We acknowledge that Bishops were always esteemed the proper Judges of the Canons both for compounding of them, and executing of them, but with this caution, that to make them Laws [she means such laws, for observance of which secular coaction might be used] the confirmation of the Prince was required; and to give the Bishop a coercive Power to execute them, the Prince's Grant or Concession was needful [So that Bishops may both compose and execute Canons in the King's Dominions, and use the Ecclesiastical Censures by their own Authority, without the Prince; only they can use no Coaction by pecuniary, or corporal punishments &c. in the Execution of them without his; which is granted to him.]

Aquin; Vindic. of the Church of England, p. 269. he saith, 'That in Cases that are indeed Spiritual or merely Ecclesiastical, such as concern the Doctrine of Faith or Administration of the Sacraments, or the ordaining or degrading of Ecclesiastical persons. Sovereign Princes have (and have only) an Architechtonical Power to see, that Clergy-men do their Duties. [i.e. not what he, but what their Superiors in Spiritual matters, judge to be so.] And *Schisme Guarded*, p. 136. 'We have nothing concerning any Jurisdiction merely Spiritual in all the Statutes of Henry the Eighth. They do all intend coercive jurisdiction in the exterior Court of the Church. 'We give the supreme Judicature of Controversies of Faith to a General Council, and the supreme Power of Spiritual Censures which are coercive, only in the Court of Conscience [and suitably, in the interval of General Councils he must allow to National Synods the same Judicature, and Censures, abstracting from the Prince.] *Ibid.* p. 92. he saith, 'We see the Primitive Fathers did assemble Synods, and make Canons before there were any Christian Emperors. [And then may not they do the same still? Both assemble

33
Catholick THESES.

Synods, as the Apostles did at *Jerusalem*, *A.D. 15.* And make Canons: and then also publish them made, as the Apostles did, when an Heretical Prince concurreth not with, or else opposeth them? Provided that there be no apparent danger to the Prince or State, of any Sedition by such meeting.] But they had no coercive Power to compel any man against his will. [This therefore is the Power, which Emperors when become Christian, and her Subjects, bring in, and add to the Church, without taking away from it any of that Power, which before, from Christ's time, it was possessed of under Heathen Princes.] The Summe is, He challengeth for the Prince only a double coercive Power with his temporal Sword, which is either executed by himself, or committed to the Church Governors, one for constraining, of the Laity to the obedience of the Church, the other of the inferior Clergy to the obedience of their Superiors in all Spiritual matters.

§. 18.

The same saith Dr. Fern (*Answer to Champny*, 9. c. p. 284.) It is a mistake, that the Prince, by his supreme Power in Spiritual and Ecclesiastical things, is made supreme Judge of Faith, and Decider of all Controversies thereto belonging, and may ordain what he thinks fit in matters of Religion. Who also in his *Discourse of Presbytery and Episcopacy*, p. 19. Grants, That no Secular Prince can justly prohibit, within his Dominions the exercise of Ordination and of Judicature, so far as the Keys left by Christ in his Church do extend; nor prohibiting, is to be obeyed, and Christ's Substitutes herein being denied the assistance of the Civil Power, are to proceed without it. And (*Exam. Champny*, p. 290.) saith, That the Bishops and chief Pastors of the Church are the immediate, proper and ordinary Judges in defining and declaring what the Laws of Christ be, for Doctrine and Discipline. That they have a coercive Power in a spiritual restraint of those, that obstinately gainsay. So DR. FERN.

§. 19.

Maison de Ministerio Anglicano, 3. l. 3. c. asketh the Question. *Quis enim nostrum unquam affirmavit Principes in causis Fidei & Religionis supremos esse Cognitores & Judices?* *De hoc a Cardinale Bellarmine, & aliis Pontificibus, Ecclesia Anglicana*

*Anglicanae illatae iniuria fit clavis conquestrus est. Dottissimus
Whitakerus, &c.* 1611. Anno (ii. Regis 1. & 1. C. anno 1610.)

§. 20.

Dr. Field, *Of the Church*, p. 667. ‘The State of the Christian Church’ (the good things it enjoyeth, and the felicity it promiseth, being Spiritual) is such, that it may stand, tho’ not only forsaken, but greatly oppressed, by the great men of the world. And therefore it is by all resolved on: That the Church hath her Guides and Rulers distinct from them that bear the Sword, and that there is in the Church’s Power of convocating those her Spiritual Pastors to consult of things concerning her welfare, tho’ none of the Princes of the world do favour her. And p. 81. Touching Errors of Faith, or Oberrations in the performance of God’s worship and service (saith he). There is no question but that Bishops and Pastors of the Church, to whom it pertaineth to teach the Truth, are the ordinary and fittest judges; and that ordinarily and regularly Princes are to leave the judgment thereof unto them. And below, ‘We do not attribute to our Princes, with their Civil Estates, power newly to adjudge any thing to be Heresy without the concurrence of the State of their Clergy; but only to judge, in those matters of Faith that are resolved on, [i.e. in informed Councils] according to former resolutions.’ And the same much what is said by Dr. Heylin, *Reformation Justified*, p. 8c, 81. in affirming, ‘That if the Reformation be in such Points of Doctrine, as have not been before defined in such manner [i.e. in a General Council, or in a particular Council universally received] The King only with a few of his Bishops and learned Clergy, who never so well studied in the Point disputed, can do nothing in it. That belongs only to the whole Body of the Clergy in their Convocation, rightly called and constituted. By these Expressions the Reformation, allowed to Christian Princes, seems only of Errors, first declared such, either by the Resolutions of former lawful Councils, or of a new lawful Council of Clergy first had; which will easily be granted them. Provided that Councils be understood in their due Subordinations, and according to their due votes; not the Decree of some inferior Synod preferred by such Prince to the

Decree

Decree of a Superior, nor the vote of a Minor part in a Synod (or of some Clergy out of it) before that of a Major part. But if they mean, the Princes taking the Guidance of some Council against a Superior, or of some part of the Clergy opposed by a Major, this is only deluding the Reader, and in effect granting nothing.

§. 21.

Again thus Dr. *Field* of the casting of any person into, or his Deposition from the Ecclesiastical Ministry, *Ibid.* p. 681. ‘It is resolved that none may ordain, I add or force the Clergy to ordain; any to serve in the work of Ministry, but the Spiritual Pastors and Guides of the Church. *etc.* That none may judicially degrade, or put any one lawfully admitted from his Degrees and Order but they alone; [else had the Secular Magistrate no other Power, yet, if he may please, and discipline Clergy at his pleasure, within his Dominions, he may hereby advance or despise what Sect of Religion, what Doctrines, what Discipline he plemeth.] Next of the Power of the Prelates of the Church to call Councils independently on Princes, p. 668. ‘It is evident (saith he) that there is a Power in Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates and Patriarchs, to all Episcopal, Provincial, National, and Patriarchal Synods, and that neither so depending on, nor subject to, the Power of Princes, but that when they are Enemies to the Faith, they may exercize the same without their consent and privity; and subject them, that refuse to obey their Summons, to such punishments as the Canons of the Church do prescribe in cases of such contempt, or wilful negligence. To which may be added that of Bishop *Bilson*, *Government of Christ's Church*, 16 c. ‘When the Magistrate doth not regard, but rather afflict the Church, as in times of Infidelity and Heresy, who shall then assemble the Pastors of any Province to determine matters of doubt or danger? To which Question he Answers; The Metropolitan. [When they are Enemies to the Faith (saith Dr. *Field*) I understand him; either when Enemies to the Christian Faith, as Heathen Princes; or if Christian, to the Catholick Faith, as Heretical Princes; for the Church hath as well need of using these her Privileges against Heretical Princes, as Heathens; otherwise the latter may do her as much mischief as the former.] Next;

Next; what is said here of *calling Councils without such Princes consent*, I apply to the exercise of all those particulars, which are allowed to be the Chatches Rights, and to have been exercised by her under Heathen Princes, as in this Council assembled the making Decrees in points of Doctrine controverted, and Canons for her Government; The publishing and requiring obedience thereto from all her Subjects, in whatever Princes Dominions, and punishing with the Church Censures the Refractory.]

§. 22.

And with these Church-Privileges and Practices not only as to Heathen, but Heretical Princes, Bishop *Andrew Tort. Tort. p. 377.* also seems well content. Who (in answer to Bellarmine), saying the Authority alledged out of the New Testament to be given to Princes, was to the Heathen, who yet had no Primacy in Ecclesiastical, and therefore these places served nothing for proving such a Primacy) grants neither Infidel Princes, nor yet Christian, if Heretical, to have an Ecclesiastical Primacy over God's Church. *Primation ad Reges infideles pertinet non potest* [these Texts]: *Nisi fuerit magis ad eos in novi, quam ad Abasnerum, vel Nabuchodonosor, in veteri — Interim sit vel Infidelis, sit vel Hereticus, crederetur pro. &c.* And, *Nisi id agitur, ut Ecclesiæ Persecutores, Tiburtii, Caii, Ecclesiæ Gubernatores habentur. Tunc denun- ciero Ecclesiæ Gubernacula capessent, eam conuersi ad fidem futuri* [idem, i. e. Christianam; if Heathen: Catholicam, if Heretics.] After him *Mason. De Ministeriis Anglicano*, 3. l. 3. t. In case not only of Infidelity but of Heresy, or yet, if I mistake him not, in any other eminent Defect of Sanctity, denies to Princes at least the Exercise (whatever remote Power he placeth in them) of some branches of their Primacy. *Regibus (sicut he) qui vel non sunt Christiani; vel si Christiani, non tamquam orthodoxi; vel si orthodoxi, non tamquam Sancti; Pri- matus competit quidem sed secundum quid; id est quod antea regiam, non quod rectius & plenius sive autoritatis; quod afficiunt, non quod illustrerent exercitacionis offici.* [None such therefore may execute any Ecclesiastical Primateship, so as by virtue of it, to do any thing against the Acts of the Clergy, in Spirituals; unless this Author seek some refuge in the Epithetes, *rectius, plenus, and illustris.*] After

§. 23.

After the former Passages of Bishop *Andrewes* and *Mason*, See Dr. *Hammond* in his Answer to *S. W. Schism disarmed*, p. 203; who (in the Dr.) words, (*Schisme*, p. 125.) that the Canons of the Councils have mostly been set out, and received their Authority by the Emperors, replied, "That never was it heard, that an Emperor claimed a negative voice in making the Canon of a Council valid, which concerned matter purely Spiritual." To which Dr. *Hammond* returns this, "For the appendage &c I need not reply, having never pretended, nor seemed to pretend, what he chargeth on me, concerning the Emperors negative Voice in the Council; what I pretended I speake out in plain words: That the Canons have been mostly set out, and received their Authority by the Emperors, and thus receiving their Authority is (I suppose) in order to their powerful Reception in their Dominions: and this he acknowledgeth, and so we are friends." By Dr. *Hammond's* consent then, A negative Voice the Prince hath not to reverse, or contrary the Church Canons in Spiritual matters; only thus he may be said to give Authority to them, by causing a powerful reception of them in his Dominions. Powerful, i. e. by assisting the Church in the Execution of them with this coercive Power.]

And elsewhere, Answer to *Schism disarmed*, p. 164 he grants in the Controversy of Erecting Metropoles. "That if the Prince exerciseth this Power so, as to thwart known Canons and Customs of the Church; this certainly is an abuse: And afterwards saith, It is invalid, as doing wrong to another in those Privileges he enjoys by the Canon.

§. 24.

Thus also *Grotius*, *Rheus*, *Apol. Discuss.* p. 70. (well seen in the Imperial Rights) not long before his death *Imperaturum ex Regum aliquod officium etiam circare Ecclesie in confessione. At non tale, quale in Seculini negotiis, ad tutandos, non ad violandos Canones jus hoc comparatum est. Nam cum Principes filii sunt Ecclesie, non debent vi in matrem uti, omne corpus Sociale jus habet quedam constitutendi, quibus membris obligenter; hoc jus etiam Ecclesie competere apparet*, Act. 15. 28. Heb. 13. 17. Where he quotes *Facundus*, laying of *Martianus*, *Cognovit ille quibus in causis intercesserit Principis potestate, & in quibus*

quibus exhiberet obedientiam Christiani. And obedit Prepositis,
sicut he) etiam Regibus dictum.

I will conclude with the Sentiments of our two last most Gracious Sovereigns, King *James*, and King *Charles* the First, in his Defence of the Right of Kings against Cardinal *Perron*, p. 427, 428. ‘It is granted (saith he) That if a King shall command any thing directly contrary to God’s Word, and tending to the Subversion of the Church, that Clericks in this case ought not only to dispense with Subjects for their Obedience, but also expressly to forbid their obedience, for it is always better to obey God, than Man. Howbeit in all other matters, whereby the Glory and Majesty of God is not impeached, it is the duty of Clericks to ply the people with wholesome Exhortations to constant obedience, &c. [Therefore the Clergy are the Judges for Christ’s Flock, whatever Princes Subjects they be, when the Prince commands any such thing: which how it consists with another judgment of the Prince concerning the Doctrines of the Clergy, whether these command any thing against God’s Word; a judgment not only discretionary for himself, but prescriptive also to his Subjects, in prohibiting, that no such Doctrine be taught to them by the Clergy, I cannot divine; unless there can be two ultimate Law-givers, in the same matters, over the same persons; both whom delivering contrary things, they may be obliged to obey.] Again a little before. ‘I grant (saith he) That it is for Divinity Schools to Judge, How far the Power of the Keys doth stretch: I grant again, That Clericks both may, and ought also to display the Colours and Ensigns of their Censures against Princes; who violating their publick and solemn Oath [The King speaks of Christian Princes] Do raise and make open War against Jesus Christ [he means in maintaining some Heresy, and opposing his Church]: I grant yet again, that in this case they need not admit Laicks [Doth he not here, also include Princes?] to be of their Council, nor allow them any scope or liberty of Judgment, yet all this doth not hinder Prince nor People, from taking care of the preservation of their own Rights and Estates [That the Clergy pass nothing prejudicial to these Rights,

§. 25.

Catholick THESES.

for which there is all good reason. Again; ‘The Emperors (faith he) in making use of their Authority in Councells took not upon them to be infallible Judges of Doctrine, but only that they might see and judge whether Bishops did propound nothing in their Convocations and Consultations, but most of all in their Determinations, to undermine the Emperors Authority, to distract the tranquility of the Common-wealth [i. e. in their meddling in civil affairs] and to cross the Determinations of precedent Councils. Thus King James.

§. 26.

King Charles in his last Paper in the Isle of Wight, p. 3. Speaking of the several Branches of Episcopal Authority practised under Heathen Princes. ‘Tho the Bishops (faith he), in the times of Pagan Princes had no outward coercive Power over mens Persons or Estates [as also no more have they now, except from, and during, the Prince’s pleasure] yet in as much as every Christian man, when he became a Member of the Church, did *ipso facto*, and by that his own voluntary Act, put himself under their Government [So Christian men do still, Princes and all] They [then] exercised a very large Power of Jurisdiction in *Spiritualibus*; In making Ecclesiastical Canons, receiving Accusations, convening the accused, examining Witnesses, judging of Crimes [against the Evangelical Law] excluding such men as they found guilty of scandalous offences, from the Lord’s Supper, enjoining Penances upon them, casting them out of the Church, receiving them again upon their Repentance, &c. [I subsume, the same making of Ecclesiastical Laws and Canons, the same Examinations, Excommunications, and casting out of the Church, &c. are, and must be, allowed still, in Christian States also being things, which (as Bishop Garleton) Princes can neither give to, nor take from, the Church. And therefore they must also be allowed all those means, absolutely without which no such things can be done. As convening, keeping intelligence one with another, Promulgation of their Acts and Decrees, &c. And when the Christian Prince or State becomes to them such, as the Heathen were, in his with-holding or prohibiting these necessary things, then may they reforme that behaviour, as was practised formerly, in Heathenisme,

i. e.

i.e. do these things without the States leave, or against its Prohibitions.]

§. 27.

After this copious Account given you of learned and judicious Protestants, touching so weighty a matter, let us now look back upon them, and see in what Posture things are left. The Ecclesiastical Supremacy, that is commonly attributed to the Civil Power, seems to consist chiefly in all, or in some one of these three.

1. His strengthening and promoting the Acts of the Church and its Governors, with the assistance of the Secular Sward: and his making their laws, the Laws also of the State. One Branch of which power consequently is, The opposing and suppressing by the hand of Civil Justice, any such Ecclesiastical Acts of Inferior and Uncanonical, and illegal Persons or Synods, as go against the Superior, and legal, (the Church being always the Judge in this matter, what Acts are against, and disowned by her,) which is indeed the Princes not opposing, but defending the Church.

§. 28.

2. Or 2dly, His opposing and abrogating some of the Churches Canons and Laws of Government, in purely Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Affairs (for in Civil, all Princes, Heathen also and Heretical may rescind any such Ecclesiastical Acts, as do any prejudice to the temporal Power, which God hath committed immediately into their hands.) as pretended contrary to the Law of Christ, or to Christian liberty, &c.

3. Or 3dly, His declaring and reforming, against their Decrees in matters of Faith and Manners as some way contrary to God's Truth, and the Doctrine of the Scriptures.

For the first of these, It is an Ecclesiastical Supremacy, or a Supremacy in Ecclesiastical matters, which the Church hath never denied to belong to Secular Princes, but as obliged to them for it, and many Acts thereof may be, and sometimes have been, performed even by Princes Heathen, or Heretical. Many Instances thereof are collected by *Mason, De Ministerio Anglicano*, p. 313. in *Nabuchodonosor, Cyrus, Darius*, under the Old Testament. *Tiberius, Adrian, Antoninus Pius, &c.*

§. 29.

Catholick THESES.

And afterward of several of the *Gothick Kings* under the New.

For the other two, These Protestant Authors forecited grant, That so often as any Prince falls into Heresy, or in general opposeth the Christian Faith, the exercise of such Supremacy concerning matters of Faith, and Church Government returns to the Church alone, as it was in the Church alone, before *Constantine*. Again the judgment of Heresy (and consequently when Princes are Heretical, and so fallen from the exercise of any such Supremacy) is by several of the former quotations, See before, §. 21, 22. &c. granted to belong to the Church. But suppose the Christian Prince to be also Catholick, yet the limitations of several of the forecited Authors seem hardly to allow him any such Branches of Supremacy. For touching Errors of Faith, or Aberrations in the performance of God's worship and service, Dr. *Field*, before §. 20. saith, That ordinarily and regularly Princes are to leave the judgment thereof to the Bishops and Pastors of the Church, and in these things to judge according to their former resolutions; or in any new matter, whereof no former Definition hath been made, the Prince (saith Dr. *Heylin*, before §. 20.) is to follow the new Resolutions that shall be made not of some few, tho' never so learned, but of the whole body of his Clergy, and by consequence to follow also, not that, but the Resolution of a higher Body of Clergy, if this oppose that of his Clergy; the one being necessarily subordinate to, and conclusive by, the other for preservation of the Unity and Peace of the Catholick Church. So Bishop *Brambal* grants; That the Bishops were always esteemed the proper Judges of the Canons [*i.e.* such, as related only to Ecclesiastical not Civil, matters] both for the composing and executing of them. Only to make these Canons Laws [*i.e.* accompanied with a politick and coercive Power] the Prince's Confirmation was required. And Mr. *Thornidike* saith before, §. 15. That should the Prince forbid it, yet the Church still ought to use that Ecclesiastical Power therein, that shall be necessary to preserve the Unity of the Church [of which necessity also they, not the Prince, are by our Lord constituted the Judges.] The like saith Dr. *Taylor* of the Subordination of inferior Clergy to their Superiors, and Bishop

Bishop *Carleton* before, §. 14. of the Ordinations of the Clergy, and Institution and Collation of Benefices, and Spiritual Cures ; that they are proper Laws and Rights of the Church, not to be changed or taken away by Princes.

It seems too late therefore, now, or in *Henry the Eighth's* days, to project a Repeal of any of those forementioned ancient Ecclesiastical Customs and Canons, which we find made or practiced by the Church under the Heathen Emperors, even against their frequent Edicts (yet which could not then have been lawfully so used, if any of these had encroached on Civil Rights ; in any of which Civil Rights the Heathen Prince might claim as much lawful Power as the Christian can.) And also, which we find still continued by the Church under Christian Emperors, without asking their leave to Decree such things, or substituting their Decrees to their Authority, or depending on their consent only with humbly desiring their assistance, yet so as without it, resolved to proceed in the Execution thereof, as under Heathen ; of which we have many Experiments under the Christian Emperors, when these Arian ; yet which things the Church could not lawfully have done, were any of these entrenching upon the Princes Right, now at least when Christian. For Example, the 6th Canon of *Nice* ; and 5th Canon of *Constantinopolitan Council* ; and 3d, 4th, 7th, 17th Canon of *Concil Sardic*. concerning the Subordinations and Appeals of Clergy, would have been an usurpation of an unjust Authority, if the Subordination of Episcopal Sees, and Erecting of Patriarchs had belonged to the Prince. When also we find them excluding Princes, tho' Christian and Catholick, either from the judging in matters of Faith, and from prohibiting here that any such Spiritual Food (to use Bishop *Andrews* Expression, *Resp. ad Apol.* p. 332.) should be set before their Subjects, of which themselves first did not like the taste [which surely is judging of the good or evil of such food ; or judging in meerly Ecclesiastical causes, in any way of opposition, or review of the Churches Decrees, I mean the most supreme that may be had in it.]

§. 30.

For.

Catholick. THESES.

S. 31.

For these review the Canons mentioned but now, and see that much noted Exposition of St. Ambrose, 2. 1. Epist. 13. ad Valentin. with the Emperor *Valentinian*, presuming to examine Church Controversies, and calling them before his Tribunal. *Quando audisti, Clementissime Imperator, in causa fidei Laios de Episcopo judicasse?* Not, *Quando audisti imberem nardum baptizatum ex mariis arbitrio pendentem*, as Bishop Andronicus, *Bsp. ad Apol. v. 1. p. 29.* and others explain it; but, *Quando audisti Lascari*, [applicable to any Secular Prince] *de Episcopo indicasse*; or, if Bishop Andronicus will, *ad indicare signationes*, i.e. if they such, as *Valentinian* shall choose for *admonitus*; if these chosen be not Bishops, or Bishops of *Valentinian's* appointment, and not his Canonical Superiors; but then, these Canonical Superiors are given for the Bishops Judges, not by *Valentinian*, but by the Church. But all, who cannot see clearly, that, *dilectus amans cognitores*, i.e. such as the Emperor thinks fit, which Bishop Andronicus pleads for, as the Emperors right; and *ipse Imperator judicare* which St. Ambrose denies, names all to one? The same Father goes on. *Quo et ipsi abeat in causa fidei, in causa in qua fidei, Episcopos scilicet de Imperatoribus Christianis, non Imperatores de Episcopis judicantes. Rater tunc, cur, Deo faciente, maiorioris cui, dicatur. Non est meum indicare inter Episcopos, &c.* And thus St. Athanasius, *Ep. ad Solit. uitam agent.* Expatiulates with *Constantius*, interposing, as to the Churches Definitions about Arianisme, and her Canons, about judging and censuring of Bishops, opposing such Bishops as he took for Enemies of the Divine Truth, and countenancing those inferior Ecclesiastical Synods which he fancied to be in the right, against the Superior and against the Canons. *Quando auditus ero auditum eis, quod iudicium Ecclesie laboratatem suam ab Imperatore accepit? aut quando unquam hoc [a small number of Bishops joined with Constantius] pro iudicio agnitionis eius? Plurime ante-hoc Synodi fuerunt, multa iudicia Ecclesie habita sunt. Sed neque Pontes istiusmodi res Principi persuadere coatus sunt, nec Princeps se in auctoribus Ecclesiasticis curiosum prouidit.* And see his complaints following; That he did, *abrogare Canones, et decernendo Principem facere Episcoporum, & praesidere iudiciis Eccle-*

HEAD. IX.

43

Ecclesiasticis, which he calls there *Abomination Desolationis*. And the Reverend *Hofius* President in the Council of Nice, writes to this Prince on the same manner. *Ibid.* p. 456. *Re-formula dicti Iudicij. n. 17 miseras Ecclesiasticis, neque nobis in hoc genere praeceps, sed potius ea a nobis disce. Tibi Deus imperium commisit; nobis que sunt Ecclesiæ concedidit, neque agitur fas est nobis in terris imperium tenere, neque tu ibyminatum et suorum potestatum habes, Imperator. Nefas est enim [as] Iudeos fuisse, see Conc. Ephesin. writ to the 3d General Council when he sent *Candidianus* thither for the Preservation of Peace and Order; but not, ut cum quaque rationibus & controversiis, que circa fidic dogmata incidentia quicquam communem haberes] que *Sententiarum Episcoporum Catalogo scriptus non est, illam Ecclesiasticis negotiis & consultationibus se se immiscere.**

Where note, that the Contest of these Bishops with these Emperors, is for their judging these Ecclesiastical matters where they had no power to judge; not for judging them, when having a lawful power, not rightly; for, this latter these Princes would easily have denied, (as all secular Princes that oppose the Church do) but could not so the former. And who doth not see, which is safer, to trust the Bishop, or Prince, with the last Cognizance of Divine things? And how much it concerns Christianity, that Princes be not made (as Bishop *Andreas* would have them. *Reff. ad Bell. Apol.* p. 332.) the Discusers of the Clergy's Definitions, whether *contra legem Christi* &c; and the last Tasters of the Food prepared by the Pastors for Christ's Sheep; that, as this appears to them sweet or bitter, good or bad, so they may allow, or forbid, it to be ministered to their Subjects. *Constantius* was the first of the Christian Emperors that assumed this prerogation, and that he took for sweet and good, proved very Poison to his Subjects, and at last ended in Mahometanism. Meanwhile as doubt but Princes may afflict all the Churches Consults with their secular power, may call them, preside in them, for keeping of Order, restraining the Tumultuous and Refractory, and seeing that particulars perform what the whole declares to be their duty, as the only Supreme's there and elsewhere, of all coactive Power. This Right none can deny them.

Hither-

§. 32.

Hitherto from §. 14. I have collected and considered the Protestant Concessions in Confirmation of the Church's Rights in her Ecclesiastical judgments, and other proceedings in pure Spirituels, which are declared to be independent on, and un-repealable by, the secular power; and I have given you greater store of them than at first I intended.

§. 33. Now by these their Concessions, one would think the door were shut fast enough against any pretended Reformation at any time entring into the Church by the secular Authority opposed to the Ecclesiastical. Yet seeing that after this several pretensions are made, and that not only by others but the same Authors (as it were unhappily distracted and divided between two powerful Leaders, Interest and Truth) to bring in Alterations in Religion against the standing Church Authority, chiefly by this way, namely a Superintendency or Supremacy therein of the secular power either proceeding against all, or at most joined with some inferior against the superior Clergy, or some lesser against a much major, part (the judgment of which superior's and major part do canonically conclude the whole); I think it necessary, in this, a matter of so great consequence, to gather all those Pleas and Defences of any weight, which I have met with in these Writers, whereon they build the lawfulness of their Reformation by the secular Arm, and to shew the invalidity of them.

§. 34. To this purpose then, I find them to alledge on the other side as if they had forgot all they had already conceded: See Dr. Fern, *Answer to Champney*, p. 300. 'That the secular Sovereign Power is to be satisfied [or as it is there §. 21. to have it, by Demonstration of Truth, evidenced to him] that what is proponnded as Faith and Worship is according to the Law of Christ, before he use or apply his Authority to the publick establishment of it. *Ibid.* p. 294. And this in respect of his duty to God, whose Laws and Worship he is bound to establish by his own Laws within his Dominions, and is accountable for it, if he do it amiss. Thus Dr. Fern. Well, But may the Clergy at least publish that Faith and Worship which they judge to be according to the Law of Christ in his Do-

Dominions without him? Or may not the Prince also establish something, as the Law of Christ, when it is, as he conceives, evidenced to him to be so by some other, without or against the Clergy; or only with some minor or inferior part of them, when opposed by the superior and major, i.e. by the Canonical Ecclesiastical Judge? The first of these is denied by him, the latter affirmed. For (saith he) *Ibid.* p. 308. General Councils being the greatest and highest means of direction which Kings can have in matters of Religion; but still with the limitation, *quatenus docent legem Christi* [of which I suppose the Prince must judge]; it being possible that the major part should be swayed by Factions of worldly Interest; Therefore Kings and Emperors (saith he) may have cause given them, upon Evidence of things unduly carried, to use their supreme power for forbidding of their Decrees. And *Ibid.* 2. c. p. 73. The Sovereign Prince is not bound in the way of Prudence always to receive his directions from a vote in Synod; especially when there is just cause of fear, that the most of them, that should meet, are apparently obnoxious to factious Interests. And (p. 72.) If the Prince by the law of God stands bound to establish within his own Dominions whatsoever is evidenced to him by faithful Bishops, and Learned Men of the Church, to be the Law of Christ, shall he not perform his known duty till the Vote of a major part of a Synod give him leave to do it? Where also, p. 295. he approves the Concession of the Clergy under King Henry the Eighth. In binding themselves by Promise in Convocation in *verbis Sacerdotis*, not to exact, or promulge, or execute any new Canons or Constitutions without the King's assent. Here you see the Clergy's power so tied up, that they can publish no Christian Doctrine to the People, that is to Christ's Flock, which they do not first evidence to the Prince, and have for such publication his consent: but on the other side whatever is any way evidenced to the Prince he may publish without, and against their consent; and yet they, not he, are made by these men the ordinary Judges in Spiritual matters.

Now

§. 35.

Now here suppose the Prince receives the Directions of some Clergy men in any thing he doth ; yet since the Clergy is a subordinate and well regulated Government, and these his Spiritual Directors oppose the main Body, he is not here directed by that Clergy, that ought to be his Judge, but those that are against it. Yet still some reason were there in this, if the Prince could always be certain in his Evidence, so as not to mistake, *i. e.* to think something evidenced to him when indeed it is not ; and again to think other things not sufficiently evidenced, when they are ; so there were leis hazard in leaving Church matters thus to his disposal. But, since things are much otherwise ; and evidencing Truths to any one, by reason of different Understandings, Education, Passions, and Interest is a thing very casual ; so that what is easily evidenceable to another, may happen not to be so to the Sovereign Power, when not patient enough to be informed, when misled and prepossessed by a Faction ; when not so capable, as some others by defect of nature, or learning, and facile to be perswaded by the last Speaker, &c. to what an uncertain, and mutable Condition are Church Affairs reduced, when the Function of the Clergy depends on such Evidences made to the Prince ?

§. 36.

2. Next they urge, That (in regard that the Clergy may many ways fail, and miscarry in delivering Christ's Laws, and the Truth of the Gospel) ; 'If in matters already determined by our Lord and his Apostles, or Laws given to the Church, by injury of time the Practice become contrary to the Law, the Sovereign Power (being bound to protect Christianity) is bound to employ it self in giving strength, first to that which is ordained by our Lord and his Apostles. By consequence, if those with whom the Power of the Church is trusted [*i. e.* that Body of the Clergy, whose Acts conclude the whole ; else if only some other Clergy miscarry, this Body serves the Prince for their correction] shall hinder the restoring of such Laws, the Sovereign Power may and ought, by way of penalty to such persons, to suppress their power, that so it may be committed to such as are willing to submit to the super-

'Superior Ordinance of our Lord, and his Apostles. Thus Mr. Thorndike, *Rights of the Church*, p. 273. &c.

Now here, to omit that such suppositions and fears, that the Clergy, taken in the largest capacity, and supremest judgments, to which the Prince is to repair, when lower are suspected, shall fail at any time in the delivering to Christians all necessary Truths, are groundless; of which see what hath been said in the first Discourse concerning the Guide in Controversies, §. 6. &c. And Second Discourse, §. 12. &c. what reasonable man is there, hearing this, that will not presently ask, Who shall judge, whether that be indeed a Law ordained by our Lord or his Apostles, which the Prince would introduce, or restore, and which the Succession of the Clergy opposeth? Which Clergy surely will never confess such to be a Law of our Lord, but always will profess the contrary? Nay; will say, That the Succession of the Clergy shall keep, teach and maintain our Lord's Laws inviolably as to necessaries, to the end of the world. This Question he asketh not; he solveth not, as writing against the Presbyterians, who will not ask it him. But what can he say when asked it? Shall the Clergy judge? They deny it to be the Lord's Law, what the Prince, against their consent would restore. Shall the Prince judge? But this is most unreasonable, that the judgment of a Laick in such a Contest, shall be preferred before the whole Succession of the Clergy in Spiritual matters: and what mischief will come hereupon, if he judge amiss? And here let me set before him his own Rule. 'A difference falling out [faith he, i. e. between the Secular Power and the Bishops] so that to particular persons it cannot be clear, who is in the right [and how can that be clear, in such high mysterious matters of Divinity to any humble person, the contrary to which is judged clear by his Spiritual Guides?] it will be requisite for Christians, in a doubtful case at their utmost perils, to adhere to the Guides of the Church, against their lawful Sovereigns. Thus Mr. Thorndike.

§. 37.

Dr. Field saith much-what the same, as He: 'That ordinarily and regularly Princes are to leave the judgment of

§. 38.

G 2

'Eccle-

Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Affairs to the Bishops and Pastors; yet because they may fail [&c. the chiefest of them, else these may redress the failings of inferiors] either thro negligence, ignorance, or malice, Princes having charge over God's People, and being to see that they serve and worship him aright, are to judge and condemn them [the foresaid Clergy] that fall into gross Errors contrary to the common sense of Christians; or into any other Heresies formerly condemned [I conceive he meaneth, condemned by former Councils.] And tho' there be no general failing [in the Clergy] yet if they see violent and partial courses taken, they may interpose themselves to stay them, and cause a due proceeding, or remove the matter from one sort of Judges to another [I suppose he meaneth either from the whole Clergy to Secular Judges, or from that part of the Clergy, which the Prince dislikes, to some others of the Clergy, whom he approves.]

§. 39.

Thus Dr. Field, who, (not to urge Bishop Andrews's Observation against him. *Ad extraordinarium Potestatem confugere non solet quis, nisi deplorata res est*) here seems to fix the Prince as one, that cannot fail, thro negligence, ignorance or malice: or at least cannot fail so soon thus, as the whole governing Body of the Clergy may. What? not fail ignorance sooner then they? That is somewhat strange. Again; as one, that hath a charge over God's people, and is to see that they worship God aright. As if the Clergy had not such charge more then he, or as if he could judge what is Right in God's Worship better then they. Again he represents this Body, or major part of the Clergy, as those that may fall into gross Errors, contrary to the common Sense of Christians, and into Heresies condemned; he meaneth by former Clergy. But why may not this former Clergy be supposed, by the Prince, to have erred sometimes contrary to the common Sense of Christians, as well as the present Clergy? Or if the judgment of the Clergy of former Ages is to be followed by the Prince, why not that of the present, that is of equal Authority? But lastly imagine the Prince to fail, as he may thro negligence, ignorance, &c. may not an Ecclesiastical Power within

within his Dominions review his Acts, and reform his Errors too? But, how this, if they may enact, promulge, or execute no new Canons or Constitutions in spiritual matters without his consent? Or if this be allowed them, how may these two, both of them made supreme, and ultimate Law-givers, at the same time in the same place, reform one another, and the people subjected to them, according to their different Judgments? What Confusion!

See Bishop Andrews going the same way with the former; *Resp. ad Bell. Apol.* p. 332. *Cum in Deuteronomio dicere jubentur Sacerdotes, & docere juxta legem Dei, leget exemplar suum Rex, ut sciat an ex ea respondeant. Pascua petet, nec sibi Pastor erit, sed sibi tamen gustabit, & si amaram pabulum & noxiun, gustabit, ut Christus acetum: quod, cum gustasset, non huius bibere.* And after him Majon, *De Ministerio Anglicano*, 3. l. 3. c. p. 272. *Pastorum est, dubia legis explicare, Regum vero veritatem cognitam [sibi] promulgare; & subditis cuiuscunq[ue] sint ordinis [i. e. whether Clergy or Laity] imperare.* Ibid. p. 273. *Nec tamen splendidis hominum titulis aut suffragiorum numero, aut locorum privilegiis tantum deferet, quantum veritati [i. e. that which he conceives to be Truth]: paucis secundum Scripturas docentibus [i. e. when he conceives to teach so] potius crederet, quam 400 pseudo prophetis procuru Balis contendentibus.* And Ibid. 4. c. p. 289. *Imperator etiam in Sacro-sanctis fidei Mysteriis, pro veritate [i. e. que sibi videtur] jubere potest, & pro doctrina Apostolica, Concilii Decreto in contrarium non obstante.* And p. 297. *Neque ad primatum Regium quicquam interest, sive praelucientes Synodorum sententias habeat Rex, sive non habeat. Sive enim veritatem celestem ipsi dignoscant, sive a Prælatis suis edicti ediscant, dummodo pro veritate [i. e. que sibi videtur] jubent, & leges condant, vere se exhibent Supremos Gubernatores.*

§. 40.

Here therefore the King judgeth when, or which of the Clergy judgeth aright; and which otherwise; and is at his liberty to follow therein any number of them. And neither is he thus a Judge for himself only *judicio discretivo*, as they call it; but for others also, *judicio decisivo* (which the Clergy are
not,)

§. 41.

not); so far as to promulgate and command all his Subjects, and amongst them the Clergy, to obey that which he, upon consulting the Clergy, and hearing their reasons, judgeth to be according to God's word; and this without the consent of the Clergy at all, or at least, of the major part of them. But they of the Clergy may not promulgate any Canons or Constitutions of theirs, or what they judge according to Gods word, in such Controversy, without the King's consent. And yet; *Quis enim nostrum* (said he before) *unquam affirmavit Principes in causis Fidei & Religionis supremos esse Cognitores & Judices?*

§. 42. Now, this Primacy of Christian Princes in the vindicating and restoring God's Truth without, or also against, the Clergy, is by them maintained and supported, principally 1. By the Reformations in Religion, which they say were made by the Godly Kings of *Judah*.

2. To which some join *Moses's* correcting *Aaron's* Idolatry in making the Molten Calf; 3. and *St. Paul's* Appeal from the Jew's Ecclesiastical Court to *Cesar*. 2. 4. By the Acts of some pious Emperors cassating the Decrees of some Ecclesiastical Synods; as particularly *Theodosius* the Decrees of the second *Ephesine* Council. 3. 4. By many precedents of later Christian Princes, and amongst them the Kings of *England* before *Henry the Eighth*, vindicating such Rights of Princes against the Pope. But indeed none of these, well examined, will bear the weight they charge on them.

To 1. The first Instance (which is the main: *Habuerunt Reges*, saith Bishop *Andrews*, *Tort. Tort.* p. 379. *in veteri Testamento primatum suum atque inde Nervi, & laceri cause nostre; in novo autem deteriore jure non sunt.*) It is willingly granted: 1. That Princes may reform, and that as Supremes in the exercise of their Civil Power, in matters of Faith and Religion. 2. May reform; as Bishop *Andrews* would have it, *Ibid. p. 365. Citra Declarationem Ecclesie*, without any Declaration of the Church at that time, in Doctrines of the Church known and undisputed, and formerly declared, as those things, the Kings of *Judah* reformed in, were; and justly are Princes blamed for any their neglect in this, the duty of their Place, and

and wherein their Secular Power is much more effective of a thorow Reformation than the Priest's. 3. May reform the Clergy too ; such, as found in the Faith neglect their Duty : or also are fallen from that Faith which is taught by that Church, that is the Canonical Judge of such Controversies : and Princes in punishing such Clergy, are to be accounted Assistants to the Church. 4. May reform this Clergy, tho' these a greater number, than those professing the Catholick Faith ; because the legislative Church-power remains not in these separated, and excluded, tho' the more ; but only in the whole, or in the major part of the Catholick party, easily discernable from the Apostates, as were those deserting *Mosse's* Laws, and changing the former Divine Service, and but a few at the first. Only it is contended, that never may Princes so reform against that Body of the Clergy, which is the Canonical Judge of Controversies in matters of Faith, nor can it be proved, that the Godly Kings of *Judah* did so ; either that they reformed all the Priests ; or the High-Priest, who was always their Guide in matters of Religion ; or reformed the People against them, or reformed the People, at least without them.

The chief Reformations were made by *David, Jeboaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah*. And in all these we find an Orthodox Clergy Co-adjutors and Con-reformers, and the Prince rectifying nothing in them, but with them : and if the King's Actions appear in the Book of *Kings*, or *Chronicles* more set forth, than their's ; it is because it is an History of the Acts of the Kings, nos of the Priests. When after the flourishing times of the Church under *David* and *Solomon* in *Jeroboam's* Reign, *Israel* fell away, yet the Priests and Levites revolted not with the People ; but leaving their Cities and Possessions, went over to *Judah*. See 2. *Chron.* 11. 13, 14. -- 13. 9. -- 13. 9. and new Priests were made by *Jeroboam* for his new Worship. Afterward we find these Priests and Levites assisting *Jeboaphat* in his Reformation, 2. *Chron.* 17. 7, 8. and 19. 8, 9, 10. In the times of *Ahab's* Apostacy these Aaronical Priests were excluded ; the Doors of the house of our Lord shut up, 2. *Chron.* 28. 24. and new Priests not descended from *Aaron*, called *Cheorathim*, consecrated with many Sacrifices, and ordained for

for the new idolatrous Worship: of whom see 2. King 23. 3. Zeph. 1. 4. Hos. 10. 5. Ezech. 44. 8. To whom I will not deny, but that some also of Aaron's race joined themselves. But after this we find Hezekiah's Reformation, in the very beginning of his Reign assisted with the Orthodox Clergy. 2. Chron. 29. 11. 12. &c. *He opened the doors of the Lord,* (faith the Text, 2. Chron. 22. 3, 4. &c.) *and brought in the Priests and the Levites;* viz. whom Abaz had excluded not long before. Afterwards these Priests of the Lord being excluded again from officiating in a greater persecution of *Manasses*. Yet by him at last repenting we find them also restored, and officiating in the Temple before Josiah's time, 2. Chron. 33. 16. And in the next Chapter, 2. Chron. 34. Josiah perfected the Reformation, which his Grand-father had begun, by their Assistance; and particularly by that of the High-Priest Hilkiah; who also found in the Temple, the Book of the Law, this in those times, (at least entire) being very rare, and communicated it to the pious Prince, who had neither seen it, nor heard it read before this Eighteenth Year of his Reign, and therefore must formerly have learnt God's Service, and the true Religion, to which he now so zealously reformed the People, not from the Scriptures, but from the Priests. Neither were any of those Priests and Levites, that assisted King Josiah, such, as had before Apostatiz'd under *Manasses*, in that Josiah would permit none of those Levitical Priests who had formerly offered Sacrifices in the High-Places, tho' these to the God of *Israel*, afterward to officiate at the Lord's Altar in *Jerusalem*; but only indulged them their Diet with the rest of the Priests: See 2. King. 23. 7. 9. This Good King Josiah was the last Reformer. And if the Clergy after this fell away in a much greater number, so did the Princes too much more irrecoverably. But in those times also when it is said, 2. Chron. 36. 14. *That all i.e. very many, as it is not unusual in Scripture,] of the chief of the Priests, and of the People transgressed very much after all the abominations of the Heathen,* yet a remnant still there was, that remained Catholick, whom the rest now being *Extra Ecclesiam* King and People were obliged to obey, in Spiritual matters; a remnant, I say, Catholick as appears out of *Ezekiel*, who began his Prophecy some few years before the Captivity, where

where Ch. 44. 15. The Lord having condemned the lapsed Priests or Levites to lower service, faith of these. *But the Priests the Levites the Sons of Zadoc [either of Zadoc mentioned 1. King. 2. 35. &c. And 1. Chron. 6. 8. or of Sadoc mentioned 1. Chron. 6. 12. Grand-father to Hilkiah the High Priest in Josiah's time] that kept the charge of my Sanctuary, when the Children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister unto me, &c.* Some Priests therefore there were thro all those evil times whom God accepted and owned; and who stood firm as to the Faith; tho many of these guilty of great neglect of their Duty, of Covetousness, and several other Vices; and particularly of undertaking to foretel Good things to a Wicked people, instead of exhorting them to Repentance; and of persecuting the true Prophets, who foretold things bad; which rendered them the frequent subject of the Prophet's complaints, See Jer. 23. &c.

§. 45.

This that all the Princes Reformation in the State of *Juda* that are instanced-in, were done with the Priest's consent and assistance, none against them. And if instead of proving that these Kings did reform against the Clergy, it be urged; that at least they might have done it, because no way subject-ed in matters of Religion to the judgment of the Priest; many Texts may be produced, evincing the contrary; as particularly that *Deut. 17. 8, 9. &c.* where the Judge named, beside the Priest, may either respect those extraordinarily, sent by God and sanctified in a special manner with his Spirit, as *Samuel*, and some others; or also in general the supreme Civil Power joined for the Execution with the Ecclesiastical; or as for the Decision, the one judging for the Civil and Regal, the other for God's, Laws; but however it be, the Judge in such a Conjunction is no way authoriz'd to give Sentence in a matter of God's Law without or against the judgment of the Priest. Which appears more clearly, if this Text in *Deut.* be compared with those other relating to it, 2. *Chron. 19. 8, 9,* 10. *Ezek. 44. 24. Haggai. 2. 11. Mal. 2. 7, 8. Hos. 4. 4* or if these Texts will not evince such an Ecclesiastical Supre-macy belonging to the Priest in the Old Testament, at least other Texts do in the new. From which Texts the former

Catholick THESES.

Protestant Concessions grant such a Power, as to the judging of Controversies of Faith and of Heresy, and that without the Civil Power's having herein a Negative Voice. This to the Kings of Judah.

To 6. That urged concerning Aaron; I answer, That this Sin of his was before his being enthralled High-Priest, and at such time as Moses was appointed by God the supreme Judge in Ecclesiastical Affairs. Yet that the Tribe of Levi, following Moses, remained then not only constant, but valiant and zealous Professors of the true Religion, for which God afterward chose this Tribe for the sacred Ministry, See Exod. 32. 27. Deut. 33. 8, 9. That the High-Priest should be suspected, or accused of Idolatry, the judgment of this (as also of Heresy) and the expelling of him, found guilty out of the Church by Excommunication belongs to the Clergy united in their supreme Council, and the punishing him by other temporal Censures to the Prince.

To 7. St. Paul's Act; I answer that the supreme Court for deciding Ecclesiastical Controversies in St. Paul's time, was that newly established by our Lord; the Council of the Apostles, not the Sanedrim of the Jews. That St. Paul's Appeal to Cæsar was in no such Ecclesiastical Cause, but in an accusation of raising Sedition, of which he was charged, as well, as of being a Sectary, Act. 24. 5. 12. 18. wherein, brought before Festus's Tribunal, he pleaded Not-guiley; and upon his Adversaries seeking to kill him, before judgment given, appealed to Cæsar's, i. e. from one Civil Tribunal to another higher.

To 8. The Acts of the Emperors, and that especially of Theodosius; I answer, That these being mentioned before for Branches of the Royal Primacy in Ecclesiasticals, as to confirm those Acts in Spiritual matters, which the Church owneth as legal and canonical, so to suppress and annul, the illegal and uncanonical Acts of any Ecclesiasticks contrary to those of the Church (in both which the temporal Powers equally assist the Church) those Acting of the Emperors in Church matters that are here urged, are only in these two kinds,

kinds; and so are allowed, and such in particular was that *Act of Theodosius*, in dis-avowing the Decree of the second *Ephesine Council*: which Decree, being opposed by the Bishop of *Rome's* Legates in the Council, and by himself, and all the Western Churches, and divers of the Eastern Bishops out of it; and several of those, who voted for it in the Council, being with threats forced thereto, as appears by their complaint made hereof in the following Council of *Chalcedon, Concil. Chalced.* *Act. 1.* was illegal and not obliging: and upon this ground or motive, the Emperor's assistance requested by *Loz*, for the nulling of its Acts; as may be seen in the beginning of the Epistle he writ to him, wherein upon such reasons given he desires the Emperors favour, *Epist. 43.*

To 4. The Practice of later Christian Princes preceding the times of *Henry the Eighth* (much preficed by Bishop *Brambal in Vindication of the Church of England*, 5th and 7th Chapters) I answer; that all oppositions whatever of Civil States to the Ecclesiastical Power are not denied to be just or lawful; but only those which oppose his Decrees, Canons of Government, relating to matters purely Spiritual and Ecclesiastical; that the most of those, which the Bishop instanceth in, are not so (not about matters of Faith and Manners, or Church Discipline, or the Sub-ordinations of the Churches Judicatures, and Execution of her Laws and Censures, as to these) but Contests either about those things which the Church possessed, not by her own right, but Princes former Donations; or in matters apprehended by Princes some way hurtful or prejudicial to their Civil Rights and Liberties. As for Example, About the Patronage of Bishopricks, and Investiture of Bishops, several Revenues, and Pensions given to, or exacted by, the Church; and Exemption of Lands and Estates from Tribute; Exemption of the Clergy from Secular Courts in Civil, or also Criminal matters; Appeals made to, or Bulls brought from *Rome*, relating to matters, the Cognizance whereof belongs to the King's Court, and therefore these matters to be considered by the Prince, whether not such, before that his Subjects may submit to them. Of which may be used the Bishops forecited §. 17. Observation on the

To 4.
§. 49.

37th Article of the Church of *England*. You see that all here is Political. But then granting that some other instances are such as offend against the Churches native Rights, as some Contests here in *England* did; for opposing which some holy Bishops here suffered much Persecution: yet the proving such Facts to have been done, even before the times of *Henry* the Eighth, proves not their lawfulness to be done; and next how far soever such Acts may be shewed to have passed in restraining some claims of the Church, yet the Bishop confesseth that for *Henry* the Eighth's abolishing the usurped Jurisdiction (as he calls it) of the Bishop of *Rome* or Western Patriarch, he finds no Pattern in these former Acts of Christian Princes. His words are, *Vindication of the Church of England*, p. 184. 'Lastly *Henry* the Eighth abolished the usurped Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome* within his Dominions. The Emperors did not so. Whether [saith he conjecturing at the reasons of it] that they thought it not fit [I add or lawful] to leave an old Patriarch; or because they did not sufficiently consider the right bounds of imperial power, especially being seconded with the Authority of an Occidental Council [but no such Council would second them, or did *Henry* the Eighth in this busines]; or because they did not so clearly distinguish between a beginning of Unity, and an universality of Jurisdiction [for if they had, they had wronged this Patriarch]; or because they had other remedies wherewith to help themselves, I cannot determine.'

By what is said it may appear, how improper the foresaid Instances are to prove, in Christian Princes, a Power to reform the supposed Errors of the Clergy in their Doctrines of Faith or Manners; the second thing they have urged.

§. 50.

3. Again; They urge, 'That it is not fit nor safe that the Clergy should be able by their Constitutions, and Synodical Acts to conclude both Prince and People in Spiritual matters, until the Stamp of Royal Authority be imprinted on them. Dr. Heylin, *Reformation Justified*, p. 86. Dr. Fern, *Exam. of Champ.* p. 295. Where, were the Princes knowledge and assent required only on this account relating to the State; that so nothing be passed in these Synods prejudicial to his Civil Rights,

HEAD. IX.

57

Rights, it is willingly allowed : but if required on another account, relating to Religion, that so he may prohibit and suppress so much of them, as is not evidenced to him to be *juxta legem Christi*, or as he apprehends, is also against it, (of which thing he is not the Judge, yet which hath been the Pretence of reforming Princes, medling with the most speculative points in Divinity) it seems not reasonable. And thus an Heretical Prince will strangle, as he pleaseth, within his Dominions the Catholick Verities.

§. 51.

4

They urge the case of the Act of a National Clergy passing away their Spiritual Authority to a Secular Prince, and investing him, or whom he shall nominate and elect, with that Power which formerly they enjoyed in their own capacity. After which, they say, the Princes Act, or their's he nominates, have virtually the power of the Clergy, or their Synod, and do oblige as much as if they in *terminis* had agreed upon it. To give you it in Dr. Heylin's words, *Reform. Justified*, p. 84. 'The Kings of *England* (saith he) had a further Right as to this particular, which is a Power conferred upon them by the Clergy (whether by way of Recognition, or Concession, I regard not here); by which the Clergy did invest the King with a supreme Authority, not only of confirming their Synodical Acts, not to be put in Execution without his consent, but in effect to devolve on him all that Power which formerly they enjoyed in their own capacity; [amongst which Powers (p. 85.) he nameth this; to reform such Errors and Corruptions as are expressly contrary to the word of God.] 'And to this we have a parallel Case in the Roman Empire; in which the Supreme Majesty of the State was vested in the Senate, and People of *Rome*, till by the Law, which they call *Lex Regis*, they transferred all their Power on *Cesar*, and the following Emperors; which Law being past, the Edicts of the Emperors were as binding as the *Senatus-Consulta* had been before. The like may be affirmed of the Church of *England*. The Clergy had self Authority in all matters, which concerned Religion, and by their Canons and Determinations did bind all the Subjects, till by acknowledging King *Henry the Eighth* for their supreme Head, and by the

the Act of Submission not long after following, they transferred that Power upon the King and his Successors. After which time whatsoever the King or his Successors did in the Reformation, as it had virtually the Power of the Convocation, so was it as good in Law as if the Clergy in their Convocation particularly, and *in terminis*, had agreed upon it. Thus Dr. *Hophis*. And upon this ground and title it was that the XLII Articles, since reduced to XXXIX, were first introduced into the Church of *England*, being composed by certain Persons appointed by the Prince; and then, without any review, or Confirmation of the Synod, published as the Act thereof: as appears by *Philpot's Plea*, and arguing in the Synod to *Mariæ*, when the Clergy questioned these Articles and subscribed that they were wrongfully entitled to the Synod, which had never passed them: See for this matter, *Fax. Ab.* p. 1282. And *Id. p. 1704*, Arch-bishop *Crammer's Tryal*. And *Fuller's Hist. Ecclesiast. v. l. p. 420*. And Dr. *Fern, Examen Champy. p. 74*.

§. 52.

To all which may be answered: That the Canons of the Church permit no such Translation of the Clergy's Authority to the Secular Power; neither yet is the supreme Power of composing or changing Articles of Faith and Religion, or making other Ecclesiastical Laws, as to any Nation, vested in the National Synod thereof; as appears at length from the Sub-ordinations of Clergy, both Persons and Synods in the Catholick Church, which in several States is only one, for preserving of the Churches Faith and Government for ever in unity; of which see more *Head 6. Thes. 1. &c. 2. Discourse concerning the Guide in Controversies. §. 24. &c. Confid. on Council of Trent, §. 9. &c.* And so such National Synods cannot give away what they have not. Nor, were it so, have they any Power of Alienating this Authority, for which they are personally set a part from the rest of the world by our Lord, with a successive solemn Ordination, and of which well or ill managed, they themselves must give account to our Lord: No such Power of Alienation being contained in the original Grant thereof. But if, without such express Licence, they can give away some Part to the Laity (where also no necessity

is pretended) then why not any part of their office; and so depute Laicks to ordain Ministers also and consecrate the holy Eucharist? To which may be added: That no part of the Clergy Duty depends more on their personal Abilities, and long preparation by Study then this we speak of; The composing of Articles and Canons, the reforming of Errors, &c. Least of all therefore seems this committable to the Prince, either that he himself should perform it, whose Regal imployments require a far different Education; or that he should delegate it to others; by which the Clergy authorizeth they know not whom, perhaps some persons heretical, (if such happen to be Favourites of the Prince) to establish in Religion the Clergy knows not what (for this Concession is made by the English Clergy without any Reservation of a Revisal.)

They urge (to give you it in Bishop Bramhall's words, *Vindic. of the Council of England*, p. 257.) 'That since the Division of Brittain from the Empire [i.e. since Britain's being governed by Princes of its own, who therefore in their Territories have the same Authority that the Roman Emperors formerly had in the Empire, See Dr. Hammond, *Schism* p. 124.] 'No Canons are, or ever were, of force with us further then they were received, and by their incorporation became Britannick Laws. Which as they cannot, or ever could, be imposed upon the King and Kingdome by a foreign Patriarch by constraint, so when they are found by experience prejudicial to the publick Good, they may as freely by the same King and Kingdome be rejected. And so Dr. Hammond, Of Schism, p. 125. 'The Canons of Councils have mostly been set out, and received their Authority by the Emperors.'

I answer: All this is true: 1. That the Church Canons are not of force, as so any Coactive Power to be used in the Execution of them by Clergy or Laity, before made the Emperors or other Princes Laws. For which take the same Bishop Bramhall's Exposition, when I believe he had better considered it: *Schism Guarded*, p. 52. 'We see the Primitive Fathers did assemble Synods, and make Canons before there were any Christian Emperors, but that was by Authority
meirly'

§. 53.
5.

‘meerly Spiritual. They had no Coactive Power to compel any man against his will. And p. 119. We acknowledge that Bishops were always esteemed the proper Judges of the Canons both for composing of them, and for executing of them, but with this caution; That to make them Laws the Confirmation of the Prince was required; and to give the Bishop a Coactive Power to execute them, The Prince’s Grant or Concession was needful. 2. That the Church Canons are not of force at all, when these Canons relate to any civil Right, without the secular Magistrate’s precedent admission of them, of whose proper Cognizance such Rights are. But meanwhile all Ecclesiastical Canons, whether concerning the Faith or Government and Discipline of the Church, so far as they do not encroach on any such civil Rights (as I presume all those made by the Church when under Heathen Governors will be granted to be) are in force, in whatever Princes Dominions, so as to render all the disobedient liable to the Church’s Censures, tho the Christian Prince never so much oppose and reject them. And this granted, more is not desired; for thus no Members of the Church at any time can be free from the strict observance of such Canons by any secular Authority or Patronage.

§. 54

6.

6. They urge, That in any Princes Dominions the Clergy’s liberty to exercise actually their Function, and the application of the matter on which it worketh; *viz.* of the Subjects of such a Dominion, are held from the Crown; so that a Christian Prince, by denying this, lawfully voids the other, as he thinks fit. ‘We draw (faith Bishop Brambal, *Vindic.* p. 268.) ‘or derive from the Crown, Liberty or Power to exercise ‘actually and lawfully upon the Subjects of the Crown, that ‘habitual Jurisdiction which we receive at our Ordination. And in his Reply to *Chakel.* p. 291. he makes Ecclesiastical Persons in their excommunicating and absolving the King’s Substitutes (*i. e.* as he expounds himself afterward), by the King’s Application of the matter; namely, of his Subjects to receive their Absolution from such Ecclesiastical Persons.

I answer; This again, if meant, of the liberty of the Clergy’s exercising their Functions with a Coactive Power or of some

some persons among that Clergy, which the Church owns as Catholick, being admitted to exercise their Function absolutely in such Dominions, and not others, is very true; but little to their Purpose that urge it. But if understood absolutely as to the liberty of any such Clergy at all, to exercise their Function at all in any Christian Prince's Dominions upon his Subjects without his leave, in which sense only it be-steads them, is most false. Neither may a Christian Prince be thought to have any priviledge herein, which a Heathen hath not. And as such Priviledge is most pernicious to the propagation of the Christian Religion, where the Prince is Heathen; So to the Conservation of the Catholick Religion, where the Christian Prince happens to be Heretical or Schismatical.

7. They urge, For the abrogating Church Canons; That Ecclesiastical are only humane Institutions, that Authority given by men and abused, may be again suppressed by them. So Ruet, *Grot. Discuss. Dialyj.* p. 173. in Answer to *Grotius, Discussio Ruet Apol.* p. 69. who alledged a *Jus Ecclesiasticum* for the Pope's Primacy to be conceded by Protestants. And, 'Tho Inferiors are not competent Judges of their Superiors; yet as to subordinate Superiors in matters already defined by the Church, the Sentence of the Judge is not necessary, the Sentence of the Law and Notoriety of the Fact are sufficient.' So Bishop Brambal, *Vindic. of the Church of England*, p. 253. from whence seems to be inferred the lawfulness for a Prince within his Dominions, or for a Church National, totally to abrogate the forementioned Canonical Sub-ordination of such Kingdome, or Church to the Patriarchal Authority, when this abused.

§. 55.

7.

To which *Ist* it is willingly granted, That both Ecclesiastical Offices and Canons may be abrogated for abuses happening by them: only, that this may not be done by Inferiors, or by every Authority, but by the same Authority that made or set them up.

§. 56.

2. Next for Abuses, and the Notoriety of them; that no Practices may be stiled so, where neither Church-Definitions are found against them, much less where there found for them;

nor

notis

nor where a major part of those subject to them acknowledge them as Abuses, but continue their obedience therein as their Duty. 3dly, For such things as are notorious Abuses, or most generally agreed on for such; and so Obedience withdrawn herein; yet none may therefore subtract his obedience absolutely, from such an Authority for such other matters, where their Obedience is due; and due it is still, that was formerly so, till such Power reverse that Authority, and its Injunctions as set it up. But whilst Obedience in the one is denied, in the other it ought still to be yielded. Therefore should the Patriarch make a breach upon the Civil Rights of Princes, or their Subjects, these may not justly hence invade his Ecclesiastical. And if the Priest (Patriarch or Bishop) would in some things act the Prince, therefore may not the Prince justly take upon him to act the Priest; or to alter any thing of that Spiritual Hierarchy established by Christ or by the Church, much to the good, but nothing at all to the damage, of temporal States: If any thing happen to be unjustly demanded, it excuseth not from paying just debts. The Office must not be violated for the fault of the Person: And herein may the Example of other Nations be a good Pattern to ours; who having made resistance to their Patriarch in some Injunctions conceived by them not Canonical, yet continue still their Obedience in the rest; as appears in the late Contest of the State of *Venice*, and those Opposals both of *France* and *Spain*, and *England* before the times of *Henry the Eighth*, of which *Bishop Bransby*, *In Vndeic. 3d Book, 7th Chap.* hath been a sufficiently diligent Collector, but at last found them all to come short of *Henry the Eighth's* Proceedings: See before, § 49. Neither indeed needs any Prince to fear any Ecclesiastical Tyranny so far, as to pluck up the Office by the roots, who holding the Temporal Sword still in his own hands, can therewith divide, and moderate it as he pleaseth.

§. 57.

8.

8. The endeavour to void the Pope's *Patriarchal Authority*, and the Canonical Priviledges belonging to it, by his claiming an *Universal Headship* by Succession to St. Peter, whereby they lay that the Western Provinces do now become released from their Obedience due to him as *Patriarch*; and then

then that they never owed any Obedience to him as the *Universal Head*: to which purpose thus Bishop *Bramhall*, *Vindicta papionum* [They, [the Popes] quitted their pretended Patriarchal Right, when they assumed and usurped to themselves the name and thing of Universal Bishops, Spiritual Sovereigns, and Sole Monarchs of the Church. To be a Patriarch, and to be an Universal Bishop in that sense are inconsistent, and imply a contradiction in *adjecto*; the one professeth humane, the other challengeth divine, Institution. The one hath a limited Jurisdiction over a certain Province, the other pretendeth to an unlimited Jurisdiction over the whole world. And so *Reply to S. W.* p. 69. ‘To claim a Power paramount, a Sovereign Monarchical Regality over the Church is implicitly, and in effect, to disclaim a Patriarchal. After the same manner argues Dr. *Hawmmond* concerning the Pope claiming a Jurisdiction over *England* as Patriarch upon the supposed Conversion thereof [I add, or claiming such Jurisdiction upon Ecclesiastical Constitution] and claiming it from his Universal Pastorship, that these two are incompatible. ‘Because (saith he, *Answer to Catholicke Gost*. p. 101. compared with *Sedis*, p. 107.) the one supersedes the other, and the same Right cannot be held by two Tenures. In all which I see no true arguing.

To Bishop *Bramhall* I say: The Pope may have an universal Head-ship by divine Institution as to certain Superintendencies over all the Church, and a Patriarchal by humane Institution as to some other, extending only to a part of the Church: and thus may have limited Jurisdiction (as to Place) for the one, unlimited for the other, without any Contradiction. As also the same Person hath the subordinate Jurisdictions of a Bishop (and also in some poor Bishopricks of the Rector of a Parish too) of a Metropolitan, and of a Primate, all well consisting. So one may be by a Prince made Governour of a whole Province in respect of some command which he hath over it all; and may be made by the same King, or by any other, to whom the King hath given the bestowing of such a Dignity, Governor also of one City in that Province, in respect of some other Offices, diverse from the former; which Offices he may exercise

S. 58

cise over that Town only, and not likewise over the Province. Next suppose the Popes claim of the universal Pastor-ship unjust; he cannot cease thereby to be what he is, because he claimeth something more than he is; no more to be Patriarch still, than to be Metropolitan or Primate still: nor can the Obedience Canonically due to him as such, be with-held, because on a wrong Title he claims somewhat more not due, or some other way abuseth his Office: No more then a Prince's Oppressions, or other misdemeanors discharge their Subjects Allegiance.

To Dr. *Hammond*, The universal Pastor-ship and Patriarch-ship are not one, but two Rights; and something held by the Patriarch-ship over the West, which is not by the other over the whole Church. But were it otherwise, the same Right may be held by many Tenures. A Kingdome by Inheritance; and by Conquest, supposing Conquest a Good Title against an Heir when these two are in several persons. A parcel of Land by Donation, and by Purchase. By many Tenures I say, so that as long as these are inherent in the same person, when one is judged to fail, the right may be challenged by another; and so that no other can dispossess such person, unless he prove not one, but all his titles faulty.

§. 39.

9.

9. If they cannot quit, or make forfeit the Roman Patriarchship by one of these two last Allegations: Next, they seek to dissolve themselves from it by transferring it, or erecting a new Patriarchship instead thereof; which thing, they say, is in the Power of any Prince at any time to do within his own Dominions, and so after this, that a National Church is freed from their Obedience to the former. Of which thus Bishop *Bramhall*, *Kindis*. p. 236. 'Tho the Roman Bishops had sometimes a just Patriarchal Power, and had forfeited it neither by Rebellion, nor abuse; yet the King, and the whole Body of the Kingdome by their legislative Power, substracting their Obedience from them, and erecting a new Patriarchate within their own Dominions, it is a sufficient warrant for all Englishmen to suspend their Obedience to the one, and apply themselves to the other, for the welfare and tranquillity of the whole Body Politick. And *Reply to Chalced.*

p. 238.

p. 238. 'Suppose (saith he) that the Brittanick Churches have been subjected to the Bishop of *Rome* by General Councils, yet upon the great Mutation of the State of the Empire, and the great variation of Affairs since that time, it had been very lawful for the King and the Church of *England* to subtract their Obedience from the Bishops of *Rome* (tho they [i.e. the Bishops of *Rome*, by claiming the Title of universal Pastor] had not quitted their Patriarchate), and to have erected a new Primate at home among themselves. So He. But much more copiously Dr. *Hammond*: Who relies very much on, and frequently recurs to, this Relief, for rendering the Church of *England*'s departure from this their former Patriarch free from Schism. *Schism*, p. 135. To put this whole matter (saith he) out of Controversy [i.e. concerning the Pope's Supremacy, upon the title of Conversion of *England*] it is, and it hath always been in the Power of Christian Emperors and Princes within their Dominions to erect Patriarchates; or to translate them from one City to another; and therefore whatever Title is supposeable to be acquired by the Pope in this Island upon the first planting of the Gospel here, this cannot so oblige the Kings of *England* ever since, but that they may freely remove that Power from *Rome* to *Canterbury*; and subject all the Christians of this Island to the Spiritual Power of this Arch-Bishop or Primate independently from any Foreign Bishop. And p. 142. Thus certainly the King being the Fountain of all Power and Authority, [A Supposition unproved, and denied as to Ecclesiastical Authority, and so what he builds on it unsound], as he is free to communicate this Power to one, so he is equally free to recall and communicate it to another. And therefore may as freely bestow the Power of Primate and chief Metropolitan of *England*, or (which is all one) of a Patriarch on the Bishop of *Canterbury*, having formerly thought fit to grant it to the Bishop of *Rome*; as he, or any of his Ancestors, can be deemed to have granted it to the Bishop of *Rome*. And this takes off all obligation of Obedience in the Bishops to the Pope, at the first minute, that he is by the King divested of that Power. Which freedome from that Obedience, immediately clears the whole busines of Schism, as that is a departure.

ture from the Obedience of a lawfull Superior. Again p. 132. 'Upon that one ground the Power of Kings in General, and particularly *ad ecclesias suas*, to remove Patriarchates, whatsoever can be pretended against the lawfulness of the Reformation in these Kingdome, will easily be answered. By these places you see he makes this, the Regal Power to remove Patriarchates, the main Bulwark for defending the Reformation from Schisme. *b. viii. cap. 10. fol. 129. 130. 131.*

a.
§. 60. And for proof of such a Power in Kings he instanceth a. In the Emperor *Justinian*, his erecting the Bishoprick of *Justiniana prima*, and afterward of *Carthage*; a. And the Emperor *Valentinian*, before him, his erecting *Ravenna* into a Patriarchship independent in Jurisdiction on that of *Rome*. Next he urgeth the 12th and 17th Canons of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and 38th of the Council in *Traollo*, mentioning the Emperors Authority to erect new Mother Cities for places of Justice, and the Councils ordering the Churches Metropolitan Dignity to follow it, *Ibid. 6. c. 5. 1. 4.* a. And lastly he instanceth in the Kings of *England* anciently transferring, or dividing Bishopricks, and erecting new, *Ibid. 5. 15.* See in the Author how he prosecutes these. They labouring thus by such pretended Power of the Civil Magistrate to free a National Church from any Ecclesiastical Dependency abroad.

§. 61.

In Answer to which, 1. Let it be conceded; That Sovereign Princes may present such persons, as they approve for discharging Ecclesiastical Functions within their Kingdomes; may join, divide Bishopricks, transfer Metropolitanships; or erect new ones, &c; Provided that the Canonical Ecclesiastical Superiors consent to the introduction of the Persons they present, into such places; and confer the Spiritual Authority and Jurisdiction such persons shall exercise in them: and that nothing herein be done contrary to the things established by former Ecclesiastical Canons: (which Canons if lawfully made by the Church, can be dissolved by none, save the same Authority.) The Question therefore here is; whether there being already a Subordination of Metropolitans and Primates, and their Synods to the higher Patriarchs, and their

their Synods established by the Church Canons (concerning which, see *Confid. on the Council of Trent*, §. 9. And *The Guide, Second Discourse*, §. 24. &c.) A Prince hath Authority to dissolve this, as to its obliging the Clergy, that is within his Dominions, by setting this Patriarchal Authority on one of his own Metropolitans, or Primates, which is settled formerly by the Church on another? For Example; whether a Sovereign Prince of *Pentapolis* or *Lybia*, can release the Bishops of *Pentapolis* from their Canonical Obedience to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and his Synods, and subject them to another Bishop of his own nomination, within *Pentapolis*.

And herein: 1. Their own Concessions seem against it. For Bishop Brambal thus frees the Church of *England* from Schism, *Vindic.* p. 257. "Neither the Papal Power which we have cashiered, nor any part of it, was ever given to any Patriarch by the ancient Canons; and by consequence the Separation is not Schismatical." And, "A Power (saith Dr. Hammond in *Anwer to S. W. Anwer to Schism disarmed*, p. 164.) Princes have had to erect Metropoles, but if it be exercised so, as to thwart known Canons and Customs of the Church, this certainly is an Abuse." And *Schism*, p. 60. "The uppermost of the standing Powers in the Church are Arch-Bishops, Primates and Patriarchs, to whom the Bishops themselves are in many things appointed to be subject; and this Power and Subjection is defined and asserted by the ancient Canons; and the most ancient even im-memorial, Apostolical Tradition and Custom is avouched for it, as may appear *Cone. Nicen.* t. *Can. 4. 6. Concil. Antioch.* c. 9. 20. *Concil. Chalced.* c. 19. concluding afterward, p. 66. "That there may be a Disobedience and Irregularity, and so a Schism, even in the Bishops in respect of their Metropolitans, and of the Authority which they have by Canon and Primitive Custom over them. From which, All I observe here is; That he chargeth Schism upon the Disobedience of an Ecclesiastical Authority when formerly established by Church Canon."

§. 62.
Num. 1.

2. If this be the Prince's Right to erect new Patriarchs, and null former Ecclesiastical Subordinations. 1. Either they must

§. 62.
Num. 2.

must claim it, as a Civil Right; and then the Councils have been guilty of violating it, in meeting, and establishing such Subordinations without asking them leave. For Example; The 6th Canon of *Nice*, the first General Council, and 5th of the 2d, and 9th and 16th of the 4th would have been an usurpation of an unjust Authority, if the Subordination of Episcopal Sees, and erecting of Patriarchs, had belonged to the Prince, or Emperor as a Civil Right. Nor could the Bishop of *Rome* have justly expostulated with the Oriental Bishops at the last of these Councils, for passing such a Canon for advancing the Bishoprick of *Constantinople* into a Patriarchate next to that of *Rome*, without his consent; if this thing belonged to the Emperors Civil Power, who much desired such an Exaltation of the *Constantinopolitan* Bishop. Nor would the Oriental Bishops have forborn to have pleaded this Title, especially this Council being called after the precedent, that is urg'd of *Valentinian* touching *Ravenna*, and in his days, yet such Right of the Emperor the Eastern Bishops do not pretend to at all; But in their Epistle to *Leo* earnestly request his consent, using this as one argument to obtain it. *Sic enim & pii Principes [the two Emperors *Valentinian* and *Theodosius*] complacebunt, quo tanquam legem tue Sanctitatis Judicium firmaverunt.* And the Emperors Presidents in the Council do, Art. 16th, leave the disposal thereof wholly in the Councells hands, and to be directed by the former Church Canons: Where *Conec. Nic. 6. Mos antiquus obtineat*, is strongly pleaded by the Roman Legates and also afterward by *Leo*, which voids both *Justinian's* and *Valentinian's*, or any other Emperors Innovations against the Roman Bishops former Jurisdictions further then his consent is obtained therein.

Again: Since Heathen Princes have the same Title with Christian to all Civil Rights, neither could the Church, when under them, have lawfully practiced such a Jurisdiction.

2. Or else Princes must claim it as a thing conceded to them by the Church, to change and alter such Subordinations. Now any such Concession from the Church we find not: but this we find in the 8th General Council, 21. c. *Definimus neminem prouersus mundi potentium, quenquam eorum qui Patriarchibus sedibus presunt, in honore, aut movere a proprio Throno tensare,*

tentare, sed omni reverentia & honore dignos iudicare. And yet further. Si vero quis aliqua seculari potestate fruens, pellere tentaverit prefatum Apostolica Papam, aut aliorum Patriarcharum quenquam, Anathema sit. And 22. Canon. Definit neminem Laicum Principem, vel Potentem, semet inscire electioni vel Promotio[n]i Patriarche, vel Metropolite, aut cuiuslibet Episcopi, ne uidelicet inordinata bina & incongrua fiat confusio, vel contentio: praesertim, cum nullam in talibus Potestatem quenquam potestatum vel Ceterorum Laicorum habere consentiat. Unless here perhaps, the Concession of the particular Clergy of such a Prince be urged; but none such can be valid against the Canons of their Superiors. Dr. Hammon being asked this Question; How Princes come by such a Right of Translating Patriarchs, by S. W. Answers thus. Answer to Schism Disarm'd, p. 174. [I] that meant not to dispute of such Mysteries of State, &c. finding the same things assumed by Kings as their Right, and yielded by the Church to be enjoyed by them [both which Catholicks deny, nor do his Instances prove it] I thought I might hence conclude, this to be unquestionably their due; but whether it were by God immediately conferred on them, and independently from the Church; or whether the Church in any Nation were the Medium, that God used now under the Gospel to confer it on them, truly I neither then was, nor now am inclin'd, either to enquire, or to take upon me to determine. { Not knowing, you see, which way safely to take. For if this Priviledge were conceded by the Church, may not the Church according to their Principles resume it, when abused? But if this originally a Civil Right, the Church hath usurped their Power in her making Constitutions concerning it.]

3. Such Priviledge granted to Princes would utterly overthrow the Unity of Church-Government; there seeming for preserving this, as great a necessity of subjecting the Prelates of several Regions and Countries to one Patriarch, as of several Bishops in the same Country to one Metropolitan, or Primate, or more. In that Church-Divisions are apter to arise between States totally independent on one another, than in the same State united at least in one Secular Head. And

§. 63.

that which is urged for a reason to induce the independency of National Primate, *viz.* the Division of the Empire into so many absolute Principalities, infers rather the contrary: that the universal Government of the Church (which is but one in all these Kingdomes) should be now, if possible, closer linked together, than formerly; and the more likely, that Sects, and Distractions are to grow in the Church by reason of so many States, some of which may be perverted by Heresy, or Schisme, the more need of an union in some one Ecclesiastical Head. As the Roman Common-wealth, in more dangerous Invasions of Enemies, chose a Dictator; and Armies are thought freest from Mutinies and Seditions, when committed to one General.

§. 64.

Nor can it be said, that it is a sufficient guard of this Unity, that in a General Council all these Primates and other Members of the Church Catholick are collected and joined.

For *1/2* if it lye within a Prince's Power to free his National Clergy from a Patriarch, and his Synods; why not, also from a General Council; i. e. so far as that the Acts thereof shall not conclude such National Clergy without their consent? And if the Church-Canons ordering the contrary, bind them not for the one, Submission to Patriarchs, when the Prince orders otherwise, why for the other, Submission to General Councils? But next, were a General Council a standing Court, or often, or easily convened, there might indeed be some remedy from thence; but these happening so seldom, and that on the terms Protestants require them, perhaps can be never: the standing Superiority and Jurisdiction, not移able at pleasure of Patriarchs over Primates, and so of Primates over inferior Bishops, seems a means of Unity most necessary in the long Intervalls of the other highest Courts. Else supposing, That a *Valentinian*, or *Constantius*, having the Power to translate, and erect Primates and Patriarchs, shall transfer *Ambrose* his Primacy, or *Siricus*, or *Athanasius* his Patriarchship, to the Bishop of some other City; so, as *Momy* the Eighth is supposed to have translated *Clement* the Seventh's Patriarchship to the Bishop of *Canterbury*: and what Heresy may not such Emperor advance, as he pleaseth, if he can find

at least some Clergy on his side? And what wrong did those Popes, and Councils, to the Emperor *Constantius*, in their maintaining *Athanasius* still in his former Authority and Jurisdiction against him?

The Doctor's Instances will not much trouble us, Concerning the first and chiefest, the Bishop of *Justiniana Prima*. The Emperor *Justinian's* Novel 131. runs thus. *Sancimus per tempus beatissimum Prima Justinianae Archiepiscopum habere semper sub sua jurisdictione Episcopos Provinciarum Dacie, &c. Et in subiectis sibi Provinciis locum obtinere sedis Apostolicae Romæ, secundum ea quo definita sunt a sanctissimo Papa Vigilio.* Where it is said, That this Bishop should *acnon* obtaine *Sedis Apostolicae Romæ*; not that he should have the Place or Dignity of an Apostolical Seat. (As Dr. *Hammond* (p. 103.) would have it) but the Place of the Apostolical See of *Rome*. viz. as his standing Delegate for those parts subordinate to him: the Phrase being frequently used in this, but I think never in the other, Sense; which is acknowledged by Dr. *Field* who saith, *Of the Church*, p. 963. ‘He was appointed the Bishop of *Rome's* Vice-gerent in those Parts to do things ‘in his name, and by his Authority: Naming there many other Bishops in other places executing the like Vicar-ship for the Pope: The Bishop of *Sevil*, *Arles*, *Theffalonica*, and others: and this also the words following in the Novel, *Secundum ea, quo definita sunt a Sanctissimo Papa Vigilio*, do sufficiently declare. To which may be added the Request of this Deputation of the Bishop of *Justiniana* made by the Emperor *Justinian* to *Agapetus*, *Vigilius* his Predecessor, who delaying his Grant of it, returned him this Answer; *Epist. de Justiniana Civitate gloriſi Natali vestri conscientia, necnon de nostra Sedis vicibus injungendis, quid, servato beati Petri, quem diligitis, Principatu vestra Pietatis affectu, plenus deliberari contigerit, per eos quos ad vos dirigimus Legatos (Deo Propitio) celeriter intimamus.* If you would have yet more Evidence, see the Pope's continued Confirmation of this Primate, or Arch-Bishop, tho' consecrated by his own Bishops, as usual, by sending him the Pall, and his deputing the judgment of Causes to him in his stead, *Greg. Ep. 4. l. Indic. 13.*

§. 65.

Ep. 15.

Catholick THESES.

72

Ep. 15. And 20. l. 5. Indic. Ep. 34. And 2. l. Ep. 6. The same things may be said of the Primate of *Carthage*, pretended only to be admitted to the like Priviledges with the Bishop of *Justiniana Prima*.

§. 66.

Concerning 6. the *Imperialia* of *Ravenna*. As the *Pallium* is taken for an Archiepiscopal Ornament derived from the Emperors own habit to add the more Honour to such Prelates, for which see Dr. *Hammond* in *Schism disarmed*, p. 149. So it might be solely in the Emperors Donation; but as it is a Ceremony used at the Instalment of a Bishop in the Archiepiscopal Jurisdictions, so it belongs only to the Spiritual Superiors, who only can bestow such an Authority as before *Constantine's* time, so after.

2. Whatever Priviledge that was, That *John Bishop of Ravenna* claimed, who (Dr. *Hammond* faith) was the first that publickly contested his Right with the Bishop of *Rome* (perhaps a Donation of this Pall at once for that Bishop, and all his Successors, not to be reiterated from the Pope's upon every new Election) it appears clearly from St. *Gregory*, 2. l. *Ep. 34.* that he claimed such Priviledge, not singly from the Emperors Rescript, but also from a Grant of the Roman Bishop; St. *Gregory* there denying any such Grant. And also the same *Gregory* in 5. l. *Ep. 8.* in his sending the Pall after this to *Maximianus Bishop of Ravenna*, and confirming his Priviledges. *Quae siue pridem concessa esse constat Ecclesie* mentions the Motive to be, *Provocatus*; not only *antique consuetudinis ordine*; which Dr. *Hammond* takes notice of, *Ibid.* p. 151. and applies to the Emperors Rescript: but, first, *Apostolice Sedis benevolentia*, which Dr. *Hammond* omits; *Apostolice Sedis benevolentia & antique consuetudinis ordine, provocatus* are the Popes words. But such *annexed* pretended to be received from the Church (Tho St. *Gregor* saith this Pretence was false) no way fits Dr. *Hammond's* purpose of the Princes bestowing such a Priviledge, when the Patriarch opposeth.

3. As for the Subjection of the Provinces of *Aemilia* unto it by the Emperor: if this be supposed done by him without the Churches consent, it seems contrary to the 12th Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*; which permits not to Princes the dividing or changing the former Jurisdictions of Prelates.

Yet

Yet were this thing wholly permitted to the Prince, so long as the Confirmation of such new-created Primates is still to be received from their Canonical Superiors, no Faction, Division, or Independency can be hereby introduced into the Church; nor the Protestant Cause any whit hereby relieved.

To 5.
§. 67.

To 7. The three Canons; In the first it appeareth that the Prince attempting to dispose of half the Jurisdictions of a certain Metropolitan to a new Prelate set up by himself; the Council prohibits it; and reserves still the whole Jurisdiction to the former: therefore, in this Councils judgment, the Prince could do no such thing justly.

In the two last; the Prince changing or erecting a new Metropole, or Mother City for the Seat of Judicature, the Church, not the Prince (and so this proves no Right of his to do it) orders, with very good reason, the change of the Seat of the Metropolitan to this Place of greatest Concourse. These Canons, then, which the Dr. urgeth for his Cause, are they not to good purpose for the contrary? I pray you view them. But meanwhile concerning the Point, so much driven at, the Princes making new Patriarchs, I must remind you here again of the Canon of the 8th General Council, *Can. 21. Definimus, neminem proflus Mundi Potentium, quenquam eorum, qui Patriarchalibus sedibus praeunt, in-honorare, aut movere a proprio Throno tentare, sed omni reverentia & honore dignos judicare praecepimus quidem Sanctissimum Papam Senioris Romæ, Ex.*

To 8.

To 8. The Kings of England transplanting Metropolitanships, dividing Bishopricks, erecting new ones, exempting Ecclesiastical Persons from Episcopal Jurisdiction Ex. Such things are denied to be justly transacted by the Prince's sole Authority, without the consent of Church Governors, general or particular; of which see the 8th General Council, *Can. 22. about Election.* Nor doth the Negative Argument of the Church's consent to this not mentioned prove such Facts to have been without it: especially as to the confirmation of Persons so promoted by the Prince in their Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. Which thing being once taken from the Ecclesiastical Canonical Superiors, and this power of Erecting Patri-

DA 3 H

Catholick THESES.

Patriarchies, and Primacies, and by consequence of the bestowing and transferring the several Priviledges thereof, solely cast into the hands of a Secular Prince ; and then this Prince supposed to be not Orthodox (a supposition possible;) and what confusion and mischief must it needs produce in such a body, as the Church strictly tyed in Canonical Obedience to such Superiors, and subbmitting to their judgment and decisions in Spiritual matters ? By which means this seduced Prince may lway the Controversies in Religion, within his own Dominions, what way he pleafeth, so long as there be some Ecclesiasticks of his own perfwalion, whom he may furrogate in the places of those others that gainsay. Remember the times of *Constantius*.

Meanwhile if the Churches Rights of a Canonical Subordination of all the Clergy be strictly obſerved, I know not what other Indulgment about Clergy Preferments, may not with sufficient preservation of the Churches Catholick Unity be conceded to the Prince.

This from § 59. of their Ninth Plea ; the Prince's Power to erect new Patriarchs.

§. 68.
x.o.

to. In the laſt place they ſay : " That a National Church hath within it ſelf the whole Subordination of Ecclesiastical Power and Government, See Dr. *Ferris's Case between England and Rome*, p. 26. in which a Primate is the highest ; (and thus far only ascends Dr. *Hammond*) and ſo hath a ſupreme, and independent Power in managing all Ecclesiastical Affairs within it ſelf, and delegating its Power to others. To which, I think, there needs no further Answer ; the Subjection of these Primates, or lower Patriarchs to higher, ſufficiently appearing from frequent ancient Church Canons, and being conceded by other Learned Protestants (For which, not often to repeat the ſame things, I muſt refer you to what is ſaid before in y. And in *Confid. on the Council of Trent*, §. 9. &c.) as alſo their Subjection to Patriarchal, or General Councils ; in that it hath been ordinary to execute their Cenſures upon ſuch Primates, or alſo Patriarchs, when Heretical, or otherwife faulty.

H E A D.

H E A D. X.

*Concerning the Unity of the Church Catholick in
respect of Heresies and Schisms, and other
intestine Divisions.*

Catholicks do hold ; That one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church mentioned in our Creed, is not always the Unity of a Body coextended to the Christian Profession, or involving the Church in all Christian Churches, (if I may so call them) or Congregations, or Sects : But that some Christian Churches or Societies there are, or may be that are no part of it, but do stand contradistinct to it.

They willingly grant ; That not all differences or divisions in Spiritual matters between particular Persons or Churches, where there is no Subordination between them, do render one or both of them, guilty of such Schism as to become thereby no Members of the Church Catholick.

But say, they maintain ; that all such Division wherein a particular person, or Church departs from the whole, or wherein a Subordinate Person or Church from all their Spiritual Superiors for such matters wherein Obedience is required from them by all these, or by the whole ; is such Schism, as renders them no longer any part of the Church Catholick ; nor Members of the Body of Christ.

From whence they conclude : 1. That a particular Person or Church, differing or dividing from the whole in any one Point of Faith, which is defined by the whole, and their assent or belief required thereto, cannot plead it self any more, to be one Church with, or a part of, the Church Catholick, because that is agreeable with it still in many, or in all other Points of Faith. As the *Arian* Churches agreeing in all other Credenda, save Consubstantiality of God the Son with the Father, became, by this no longer a part of the Church Catho-

Catholick THESES.

Catholick. 2. And likewise from hence they conclude: that those, who in their separation, 1. first deny not the Church, or Churches they separate from, to be true Churches: 2. Who profess themselves not to renounce an inward Communion with those departed from: 3. Who renounce not external Communion neither, if they may be admitted thereto on terms they can approve: 4. Who exclude not those, from whom they separate, from their own external Communion, that is if others will conform to them: 5. Who do not set up any new external Communion at all: 6. Lastly, Who do not publickly contradict the tenents or customes of those Churches from which they separate: Those, I say, who can plead all these things or themselves, are not thereby cleared from Schisme; because their Separation may be, tho, in none of these things, yet otherwise faulty (mentioned above); and tho some Churches heretofore noted for Schisme, have offended in some of these, yet it hence follows not, that those who offend in none of these are free from Schisme. 3. Again they conclude from hence, that those, who refuse to conform to something, which the Church Catholick requires of them, that they may be Partakers of her external Communion, and for this are by her thrust out of her Communion, are guilty of Schism, as well as those who before any Ejection voluntarily desert it. Else *Arians*, and many other Hereticks would have been no Schismaticks. 4. Lastly, That those who never were in the external Communion of the Church Catholick, yet stand guilty of Schisme, so long as upon the same reason, upon which the others left it, they do not return to it, or cannot be admitted by it.]

4. They maintain, That any particular person, or multitude joined together, dividing from the external Communion of all other particular visible Churches of the present Age, and even from those of their own Church, as well as from the rest (*viz.* from so many of it, as continue what they were, and what the Separatists also were formerly) must needs in this separate from the external Communion of the Church Catholick of the present Age [for either all, or some of these Churches, which they separate from, is so] and

and do separate from their lawful Superiors [for such is the Church Catholick in respect of any part] and so is guilty of that sort of Schisme, which cuts off from the whole.

5. They affirm, that the exercise of any sacred Function is to all Heretical or Schismatical Clergy, tho never so truly, or validly ordaine^d, utterly unlawful ; and the Sacraments and other Ordinances^s of the Church, to the Receivers in such Church, unbeneficial ; i. e. to so many, as are conscious of the Schism ; or, only thro a culpable ignorance *nescient*.

H E A D . XI.

*Concerning the Judgment and Discovery of
Heresy and Schism.*

1. **C**atholicks affirm : That all maintaining of any Tenant contrary to the known Determination of the fu-
premest judgment of the Church, in matters which she de-
clares of necessary Faith, is guilty of obstinacy, and so is Concerning
the Judgment and
Discovery of
Heresy and Schism.
Heresy. Likewise, that all voluntary departure from the external Communion of the Church Catholick, upon what pre-
tences soever of its erring, in faith or manners, is truly cause-
less, (the Catholick Church being our Guide in Spiritual mat-
ters as to both what is true, and what is lawful, to whom we
ought to assent and submit) and so Schisme.

But 2dly, taking the Protestant Description of them : viz. That Heresy is an obstinate Defence of Error, contrary to a necessary Article of Faith : and Schism a causless Departure, or Separation from the external Catholick Communion, and so alio (being causless) from the internal ; Yet Catholicks urge this as necessary ; that there must be some certain Judge upon Earth authorized to decide whether such Error be against necessary Faith ; and whether the Defence thereof be to be interpreted obstinacy ; and whether such Departure be causless. So that all the Subjects of the Church are to receive that to be Heresy, or Schism, which this Judge pronounceth

Catholick THESES.

to be so. Else what none can know, and judge of, none can punish or separate from; nor the true extent of the Church Catholick, and its Distinction from the Heretical and Schismatical, ever be discovered.

3. It is most reasonable, that in any differences of judgment concerning these, amongst Ecclesiastical Magistrates, or Courts of Judicature, the most supreme for the time being must be the Judge, to whom all ought to acquiesce. Else if a particular Person, or Church may undertake to judge these against Superiors, Heresy and Schisme will remain equally undiscovered between these two contrary Judges, as if there were none; And Heretical and Schismatical Churches will still free themselves of it by their own Judgment; and that Person or Church, which contends for such Priviledge at any time, gives great suspition that they are in such manner faulty.

4. It seems clear, that all separation of a particular Person or Church from the external Communion of all the rest, will always by such Judge either be pronounced *cavileſſ*, or the cause thereof be rectified; and so the Division cease, if these Churches that are departed from, be the Judges of it. For doubtlesſ these, if they should condemn themselves, will also correct in themselves what they do condemn.

HEAD. XII.

Concerning Submission of Private Judgments to this Church-Authority indicated in the former Heads.

Concerning 1. IT is conceded by Catholicks, That no man can believe *Submission* to any thing at all, or do any thing lawfully, against his own judgment, or conscience; as Judgment is taken here for *Judgments*. the final Determination, upon reviewing the former Acts of the Intellect; and upon considering all reasons (as well those taken from *Authority* as those taken from the *things themselves*) of what we ought to do.

2. But

2. But notwithstanding this, *sly*, It is taken for granted, That one following his own judgment in believing, or acting, is not thereby secure from believing amiss, or acting unlawfully; and therefore that every one is much obliged to take care of rectifying his Judgment, or directing aright his Conscience.

3. That the same Judgment may be swayed contrary ways by several Arguments: *viz.* One way from the Argument drawn from Authority, and another way from his *private Reason*: and that when this happens, he is no less truly said to follow, and do according to, his own Judgment who judgeth it meet to follow Authority against his private Reason, than he who judgeth it meet, and so doth the contrary; *i.e.* follow his own Reason, and reject Authority: or (which is the same) follow Authority merely for the Reasons it giveth evidencing to him such a Truth. Thus we without difficulty believe the Books of Scripture, that are proposed us for such by sufficient Authority, to be God's word; when we find in them some seeming contradictions, which perhaps our private Reason cannot reconcile. And every one, who believes, that God hath commanded him an assent, and subnission of Judgment in Spiritual matters to his Ecclesiastical Superiors, doth, in yielding it, follow his own Judgment, even when in yielding it, he goeth contrary to his own private Reason.

4. It is freely conceded, That supposing that one hath infallible certainty of a thing from private Reason, or any other way whatever, such person cannot possibly yield obedience of assent to any Authority whatever proposing the contrary to be believed by him.

5. But notwithstanding, *sly*, It is affirmed by Catholicks, That every one ought to yield assent, and submit his Judgment (even when by plausible arguments of private Reason otherways bias'd and sway'd) in all Spiritual matters, wherein such assent is required to the Authority of the Church, and those Spiritual Superiors, who are by Christ appointed in these matters the Guides of his Faith. And also, That none can ever have, from private Reason, an infallible certainty of the contrary of that which the Church enjoins him to believe.

6. But supposing, that such a certainty in some Points by
L 2 some

Catholick THESES.

some persons could be had; yet *6*, If no more may plead freedome from obedience of assent to the Church's Authority, than only those, who pretend infallible certainty (as nothing less than this seems sufficient to reject so great an Authority, and so divinely assisted); then the most part of Christians (I mean all the unlearned at least, unfit to read Fathers, compare Texts of Scripture &c. in matters controverted) will always be obliged to follow this Authority, tho against their private Reason. And, for the other, since one may think himself infallibly certain, who is not so, (for men of contrary opinions not unfrequently, both, plead it) these seem to have, as little humility, so little security, in relying thereon; especially, when, so many others, having the same Evidences, and, as these men ought to think, better Judgments, and having larger promises of Divine assistance, and lastly, appointed for their Guides, shall apprehend so much certainty of, as to decree the contrary.

7. To one who as yet doubteth whether there be any Authority, or amongst many pretending to it, which of them it is, to which God hath subjected him for the guidance of his Judgment in Spiritual matters, to such a one the use of his private Reason, in the Quest thereof, is not denied by Catholicks. But *1*, they affirm that such Guide being found, here the use of his private Reason against such Authority ceaseth for those things, wherein he is enjoined obedience to it; which indeed are but few in comparison of those vast Volumes of Theological Controversies, wherein private Judgment still enjoys its liberty. *2*, That, if by reason of a faulty search, such Guide is not discovered by him, none is, therefore, held excused from obedience to such Guide, or licensed to use his liberty, in both which he is culpably mistaken. *3*, That, as it is left to our reason to seek, so that it is much easier for us by it to find out, this *Guide*, that is appointed to direct us; than to find out the Truth of all those things, wherein she is ready to direct us: (more easy to find out the Church, than to understand all the Scriptures:) and that from the use of private Reason in some things, none may therefore rationally claim it in all.

HEAD

H E A D. XIII.

*Concerning the necessary Means or Motive of attaining
Faith Divine and Salvifical.*

1. **I**T is certain, that all Faith Divine, or wrought in us by God's Spirit, is infallible; or, that the Proposition which is so believed never is, or can be false. *Concerning the necessary means of attaining faith Divine and Salvifical.*
2. Again Catholicks affirm; that the Authority, or proposal of the Church, is a sufficiently infallible ground of the Christians belief for all necessary Points of Faith. From which Infallibility in the Church (which is clearly revealed in Scripture, and by Tradition Apostolical) delivering such Points unto them, they also maintain, a firm Faith is had among Catholicks of all those necessary Points which are not, in Scripture, or Tradition, as to all men, so clearly revealed. Whilſt others, denying this Infallibility in the Church, either miscarry in their Faith concerning some of these Points, or can have no external firm ground of their believing them.
3. Catholicks affirm also, that a right Belief of some Articles of Faith profiteth not, as to Salvation, persons Heretical in some other. But *by*, many learned Catholicks deny, That a known Infallibility of the external Proponent or Motive of ones Faith [or a certainty, not from a firm adhesion of mind wrought by the Spirit, whereby *a man is without all doubt*, but from the Infallibility of the external means of his Faith, that he cannot err] is necessary, that Faith may be truly Divine or Salvifical; See Card. Lugo, *De Virtute fidei. Dis. 1. §. 12. n. 247, 251, 252. Estius 3. Sent. 23. d. 13. §. Layman, Theol. Moral. 2. l. 1. Tract. 5. c.* or (consequently) That such external motive or means, for producing Divine Faith, needeth to be, to every man, one, and the same; Or lastly, That one cannot have Divine Faith in any one Article of Faith who, culpably erreth in any other.

Next,

Next, Concerning the necessity of an explicite, or sufficiency of an implicite, Faith.

Concerning explicit, and implicite Faith. 1. It is freely acknowledged by Catholicks, that to *some* Articles of the Christian Faith, an explicite or express Faith, wherein the Article in its terms is particularly known, and professed, is necessary to all Christians, that have the use of reason; of what condition or calling soever. But to *how many* Articles such Faith is necessary, it is not easy punctually to determine.

2. Catholicks teach that all Christians are obliged, by what means soever afforded them, to acquire an explicite Faith, of all other Articles of Faith, or Precepts of good Life, which are any way either necessary, or profitable to their Salvation, so far as their capacities, or callings do permit, or also require them.

3. That all Christians ought in general, or *implicite*, to believe; that whatever God hath revealed, or the Church in her Definitions, or Expositions of the Divine Revelations, delivereth as matter of Faith, and to be believed, is to be believed; and ought also to be ready explicitly to hold and profess whatever is at any time sufficiently proposed to them to be such. And other *implicite* Faith, than the forementioned, is not allowed; nor other *explicite* Faith, than the forementioned required.

[Therefore that Proposition [*Hec est vera Catholica fides, extra quam nemo Salvus esse potest*] as applied to the larger Creeds, that of *Athanasius*; or yet further, to all the Decrees of all lawful Oecumenical Councils, as in the Bull of *Pius the Fourth*, ought either to be understood not distributively; as if any Decree of any such Council unknown, and so not believed, or assented to, excludeth from Salvation: For, how few among Christians do know, or yield actual assent to all the Decrees of some one Council? And how can the Doctors of that Church require such Belief to all the Decrees, suppose, of the Council of *Trent*, a many of whom require it not to all the Articles of the Apostles Creed? But *collectively*, thus; That

That all that *Fides extra quam nemo Salvus*, is contained therein: and that *extra eam totaliter sumptum*, or *si tota defit, nemo Salvus esse potest.* As elsewhere, in the same Council of Trent, the *Nicene Creed* is called. *Fundamentam firmum, & unicum contra quod portae inferi nunquam praevalebant.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 3. or to be understood distributively; but hypothetically, thus, That when any one knows any such Article to have been defined by the Church (wherein a non-culpable ignorance of the Church's Definitions always excuseth) he after this, in non-believing, or in dissenting from such Article, doth by this his Pertinacy, and Disobedience to the Church, as by other greater sins, perfisted in, and unrepented of, incur the loss of Salvation.]

H E A D . X I V .

Concerning Obedience to Humane Laws, made by the Ecclesiastical or Civil Magistrate.

1. **C**Atholicks do not affirm, from God's commanding Obedience to the Ecclesiastical and Civil Magistrate, and Obedience to their Laws, That, therefore all Dis-obedience to them, or required to their Laws, is a mortal Sin. For, so, all Dis-obedience to any *Humane* of their Laws whatever, tho' never so light for their matter, *Laws*, would be mortal Sin.

2. It is manifest; that many times the matter which these Magistrates command is antecedently our duty in obedience to some Divine Law under Penalty of Mortal Sin, tho' they had not commanded it. As in matters of much consequence to the publick, or our private, good, the Charity to our Neighbour, or also to our selves, that is commanded by God's Law, requires that which the Magistrate also exacts of us. In such cases, therefore, there may be a great, and mortal Sin, committed in dis-obeying the Ecclesiastical or Civil Laws, but this by virtue of the Divine concurring with, and corroborating, them in these particular Injunctions.

Catho-

Catholick THESES.

3. Catholicks affirm, That the Breach of a humane Law (made in a thing that is left indifferent by the Divine) out of contempt may be a greater Sin, than breaking one of the Divine Precepts out of Infirmity; but this is also by virtue of our offending against another particular Divine Law, prohibiting such contempt of the Magistrate. But (such contempt, neglect, &c. set aside) that a much greater guilt is ordinarily contracted from the breach of a Divine, than only an humane command, both from the greater necessity and benefit in general of the matter of the Laws Divine, and from the supreme Dignity and Majesty of the immediate Legislator.

4. Catholicks affirm, That no humane Laws made in matters of what consequence soever, do bind beyond the Law-Giver's intention; so that such Laws, tho given in matters of greatest moment, bind not under pain of mortal Sin, (I mean, as they are his Laws) if he doth not intend them to do so. In whose Power since it is to lay no obligation, so not to lay the greatest.

5. That whatever obligation to Sin such Laws may have from the Law-giver's intention, yet that, in some Circumstances they may not bind at all (as the Divine do); as, *in Periculo mortis; cum pergravi damno, aut infamia, &c.; for quod valde difficile moraliter impossibile;* and to Impossibles Laws bind not. I say, if the thing commanded appear not of a greater consequence, than such private damage, nor hath been expressed by the Magistrate to be esteemed so. Otherwise it is presumed that the Law-Giver, in that Charity which he oweth to his Subjects, doth, or ought to, pass his Laws without any intention that they should bind under Sin in such cases.

6. Most of the Church's Laws are passed without any express Declaration of her Subjects incurring mortal Sin in the Breach of them (yet this rationally collected by her Doctors from the great consequence of the matter commanded, the heavy punishment annexed, &c.) And sometimes her Laws are so indulgent, as to oblige to a Penalty only, without any Guilt laid upon the Transgressor of them.

H E A D. XV.*Of Justification.*

Concerning Justification, whereby man hath Right, by virtue of the Evangelical Covenant, to freedome from eternal Death, and possession of eternal Life. *Of Justification.*

¶ Catholicks declare: That by *Justification* they mean both God's pronouncing, or reputing Man just, or not unjust: (*i.e.*) freed from his wrath, and from punishment due to the unjust; by God's free remission of all his former Sins. And *2d*, God's making, and so reputing, him just, or holy, by habitual Grace infused; or by inherent righteousness. Thus making God's *Remission* of the former Acts of Sin; and our *Sanctification*, (*and so*, by it, the removal of former habits of Sin,) the two parts of our Justification; or the two effects of God's mercy in justifying us. *

a. Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. 7. c. *Hanc dispositionem Justificationis consequitur; que non est Sola peccatorum remissio, sed & Sanctificatio, & Renovatio interioris hominis &c.* Again: *In ipsa Justificatione, cum Remissione peccatorum, hæc omnia simul infusa accipit homo per Jesum Christum, cui inseritur; fidem, Spem, & Charitatem.* 6. Sess. 11. Can. *Si quis dixerit, homines justificari Sola peccatorum remissione, exclusa gratia, & charitate, que in cordibus eorum per Spiritum Sanctum insunditur, Anathema sit.* Bellarm. de Justificatione, l. 2. 6. c. *Cum tam mors Christi, quam resurrectione ad justificationem necessaria esset, potuisset Beatus Paulus utramque partem justificationis, (*i.e.*) remissionem peccati, & donum renovationis tribuere morti Christi; sed maluit resurrectioni tribuere renovationem,* Rom. 4. 15. And §. *Deinde. Justificatio non ideo Solum nobis conferatur a Deo, ut Gehenna penas evadamus [*i.e.* per remissionem peccatorum] sed etiam, ut premia vita cœlestis acquiramus [*i.e.* per gratiae infusionem, & bona opera.]* And see *Ibid. c. 2. §. Quod si:* Where he makes, *remissionem peccatorum, & infusionem*

nem gratiae duos effectus Dei hominem justificantis. Where therefore *renovatio interioris hominis per susceptionem gratiae* is affirmed to be the *formal cause* of Justification; and deletion of Sin, to be the effect of it. It is spoken of the only formal cause of Justification, that is within us, and from which we are denominated really just (whereas the remission of Sin is an act of God without us); and of the deletion of the habit of Sin inherent, not of the pardon of the acts of Sin formerly committed.

After that, this is agreed on also by Protestants; that these two go always together, and that none is reconciled or received into God's favour by remission of Sin, who is not also, at the same time, renewed in his mind, and made righteous by infusion of the Holy Spirit. *b.*

a. Calvin, Institut. Lib. 3. ch. 14. §. 9. Fatenim dum nos, intercedente Christi iustitia, sibi reconciliatis Deus ac gratuitata peccatorum remissione donatos pro iustis habet, cum eiusmodi misericordia coniunctum hoc esse beneficium, quod per Spiritum suum in nobis habitat, Lib. 3. cap. 16. §. 1. *Iam utrumque nobis confort Christus, & utrumque fide consequimur, virtus scilicet novitatem, & gratuitam reconciliationem.* De vera Christiane pacificationis ratione. 2.Cap. *Si quis ex adverso abjectat non aliter nos fieri particeps Christi iustitiae, quia dum ejus Spiritu in obedientiam legis renovaruntur, hoc quidem fatendum est,* &c. Again: *Neque vero cum homines dicimus gratis iustificari Christi beneficio, tacenda est regenerationis gratia. Quia portiones eaventur, ne a nobis separentur, que perpetuo Dominus conjugit.* Quid ergo? *Douceantur homines fieri non posse, ut iustificentur Christi Merito, quin renoverentur ejus Spiritu in sanctissimam vitam;* frustraque gratuita Dei adoptione gloriari omnes, *in quibus Spiritus regenerationis non habitat;* donec nullus a Deo recipiat gratiam, qui non iusti quoque vere siant.

Mountague, Appeal p. 170. *Whom Christ doth not quicken he doth not justify.* This is directly the Doctrine of the Scripture. Gal. 3. 22. 1. Cor. 6. 11. Heb. 9. 14. Rev. 1. 5, 6. 1. Pet. 2. 9. Fathers also are cited, &c. Bishop Forbes de Iustific. Lib. 2. c. 4. *Protestantes unanimi consenserunt inherentis iustitiae seu sanctitatis infusionem cum gratuita nostrae iustificatione necessario ac perpetuo conjunctam esse.* Now

Now first that our *Justification* consists not only in the former, but also in the later, Catholicks evidently collect from many Texts of Scripture; which do apply our freedome from God's wrath, and punishment, and inheriting eternal life to this later, as other Texts do to the former. Such are these.

Rom. 3. 24. Where we are said to be *justified freely* [i. e. without any thing in us deserving it] by his *Grace* [i. e. infused, as all grant it is, at that time when God justifies us.] *Titus 3. 5. ver. 1.* Where speaking of *Baptisme*, the Apostle saith, *That according to his mercy he saved us by the laver of regeneration, and renovation* [i. e. internal] *of the Holy Ghost*; *that being justified by his Grace* [i. e. in this internal renovation &c.] *we should be made Heirs of eternal life.* *1. Cor. 6. 11.* compared with the former; where speaking of the same *Baptisme* he saith, *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus* [into which they are baptized] *and by the Spirit of God* [i. e. infused in our *Baptisme*; by which infused we are said here expressly, as to be sanctified, so justified]; and this put the last, as also *Rom. 8. 30.* it is put alone, but there necessarily including also our *Sanctification*.]

Rom. 4. 25. Where Christ is said to be *delivered for our offences* [i. e. the remission of them], and to be *raised again for our justification* [i. e. for our regeneration or renovation by the Spirit given unto us upon his Resurrection] comp. *Rom. 8. 10.*

Eph. 4. 23, 24. [where the *new man* is said to be created in *justice*] *Gal. 5. 6.* comp. *6. 15.* *Rom. 6. 7.* *He that is dead* [i. e. to Sin by a new life given by *Grace*] *is justified from Sin,* comp. *Gal. 3. 21.* *Rom. 5. 17. 21.* Where 'tis said, *That those who receive abundance of Grace, and donation of Justice, shall reign in life, &c.* And that *Grace reigneth* [i. e. in us] by [or thro] *Justice to life eternal.* It were needless to add more. To the same matter belong all those Texts, wherein we are said, *By being born again, and by inherent righteousness, to be made Friends, Domesticks, Children, Heirs of God.* All those Texts which attribute *Salvation*, or also remission of *Sin*, or punishment, either to the several particular habits and branches of this inherent Righteousness (as to that of *Faith*, of *Hope*, or *Charity*, of the *Love*, or *Fear*, or *Service* of *God*; or *Love*, *Mercy*, and *Alms* to our *Neighbour*); or to the several Acts

of these Habits, and Graces ; [i. e. to our good works, following Regeneration.]

Lastly, All those Texts, wherein God is said, *To accept persons for their inherent holiness, or righteousness.* And as this is evident in Scripture, so it is concluded by many Protestants ; that the Term *Justification*, both, sometimes in Scripture, and most frequently by the Fathers, is used to signify not only remission of Sin, but internal Sanctification : and in this Latitude have several Protestants themselves explained it. y.

y. Bishop *Forbes de Jastificatione*, Lib. 2. Cap. 4. concerning the Scriptures. *Verbum, justificari, quandoque etiam in Scriptura significare, justitia imbuī, vel donari, non diffentur per multi docti Protestantes*; contra aliorum rigidorum id pertinaciter negantium sententiam ; quoting there the words of *Beza, Zanchy, Peter Martyr, Chamier*, and others. Again concerning the Fathers, *Ibid. c. 5.* *Hanc fuisse communem Patrum omnium tum Græcorum, tum Latinorum Sententiam, ex quamplurimis illorum dictis, Augustini imprimis acerimi gratia Christi propugnatoris, nemini, in veterum lectione versato, obscurum esse potest. Res adeo certa, & manifesta est, ut dissentientes ipsimet [Protestantes] id ultro concedunt* ; quoting the Confessions of *Cakim, Chemnitius, Beza, Bucer, Chamier, &c.* to this purpose. *Imo* (faith the same *Forbes*) *multi etiam doctissimi Protestantes* *hanc ipsam sententiam secuti sunt, aut saltem eam non omnino improbarunt* ; quoting after many others, *Spatiensis*, Bishop *Mountague*, and Dr. *Peild* : Whose words are, *Append. 3. l. 11. c.* ‘The first Justification implyeth in it three things, remission of Sins past, acceptation and receiving into that favour, that righteous men are wont to find with God ; and the grant of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and of that sanctifying and renewing Grace, whereby we may be framed to the declining of Sin, and doing of the works of righteousness.

2. Again Catholicks contend, that in comparing these two concurrents to our Justification, the later [i. e. to be made internally and habitually just *ut peccatis mortui justitia vivamus*, 1. Pet. 2. 24] is the chiefer, and more principal, than the first ; [i. e. to be reputed only, not unjust, or not a Sinner.] To

To which may be added, that there being two things very considerable in Sin; the transient act, and the remaining habit; of which the later is far the worse; and of which it is necessary, that the one be deleted, as well as the other pardoned, for any one to be accounted positively just, or not impious; this later (the habit) is not removed or abolished, but by Grace first infused; and also, whether before, or rather after the same Grace infused, our former actual Sins are pardoned, is thought by Protestants a thing doubtful, and not necessary to be decided.

3. See the words of *Calvin*, in *Antidoto Conc. Trident.* Of *Beza contra Illyricum*, and others in *Forbes de Justific.* 2. l. 4. c. p. 70, 71. *Simul nos, & justificari, & renovari*, (faith *Calvin*) *dico in Christo per fidem nobis unito & applicato: neque hec an illa ordine antegrediatur, tantillum laborandum censeo, cum unam sine altera nunquam recipiamus.*

This infusion of Grace therefore, by several titles, claims the chief place in our Justification, and is that thing only in us that justifieth or maketh us to be really just; and so is usually stiled the formal cause of our Justification.

3. Meanwhile, both the one and the other being the effects only of God's mercy, Catholicks affirm: That since God justifieth us, not for those, but for the righteousness and sufferings of Christ, as the sole meritorious cause thereof, it is not necessary, as to our Justification, in respect of inherent righteousness, that this be every way consummate and perfect.

4. Nay further; they freely concede, that it is such, as, that it doth produce some particular acts perfect, and without contagion of Sin, learned Protestants assenting.

4. *Forbes*, Ibid. c. 5. *Equiv magis injuriose & contumeliose dici potest in Christi Gratiam; quam afferere, nos nibilominus nihil prorsus vel cogitare, vel dicere, vel agere posse quod purum sit a peccati Sorde?* And §. 13. *Sententia hac rigida multis etiam dictissimis Protestantibus, aliisque viris moderatissimis, semper improbata fuit;* quoting them at large, *Ibid.*

Yet, ordinarily, it doth many, or the most, mixt with several

ral imperfections; and that Venial Sins do both adhere to, and intervene between, many of the good actions of the justified. ζ.

ζ. Estius, 2. Sent. 41. 4. §. *Et justi in iis operibus, que indubitate bona sunt, sepe numero peccant, dum iis se aliquaque vel concupiscentiae, vel negligentiae, vel alicujus levioris circumstantie ad integritatem boni operis requisita defectus admiscent.* Forbes de Justificatione, 4. l. 3. c. 8. §. *Communiter sentiantur Romani, nullum Sanctorum vitare posse omnia venialia peccata per longum vitæ tempus.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. Can. 23.

Which Sins after are remitted only by God's Mercy through Christ's Merits, as those are before Justification. γ.

γ. Bellarm. de Justificat. 4. l. 14. c. In Answer to the Objection [Post primam reconciliationem Christus ociosus esset] faith, no; Quoniam peccata nostra, quamvis levia & quotidiana, ipse purgat, & sanguis ejus emundat nos ab omni peccato. Estius, 2. Sent. 42. 4. 6. §. *Nemo quantumcumque justus, nisi sanguine Christi Redemptoris etiam a Veniali peccato emundatus fuit, in regnum Dei admitti potest.* See the same in Bellarm. de Justificat. 4. l. 21. c. §. *Resp. non dicit.*

δ. Lastly, Several learned Catholicks do not hold this inherent righteousness or internal renovation so absolutely necessary to mans Justification; i. e. to remission of Sin, or capacity of future Glory, as that none possibly could, had it so pleased God, received from him pardon of his offences; or also, through virtue of Christ's merits, an eternal glory, without having such inherent righteousness, and whilst he only reduced to his pure Naturals; or that none could possibly, or justly, be deprived of Glory, that hath such inherent righteousness; *Vid. Bellarmin de Justificat. 2. l. 16. c. Reatus penæ. quartus effectus. Scotus, 1. Sent. 17. 4. F. a Sanct. Clara Deus, Natura, Prob. 23.*) But only maintaining, that it is God's Pact or Covenant, and declared Will, that Christ's Merits should, this and no other way, merit for us freedome from Hell, and life eternal: Namely, First by satisfying for our former Sins; and procuring for us this donation of the

the sanctifying Spirit within us. 2d, What Catholicks do include in, and understand by Justification, being thus explained: Next they affirm, that there is nothing in man, that can antecedently merit this our Justification; but that the sole meritorious cause of it, both in respect of remission of Sin, or any punishment due unto it, and of the donation of Grace destroying in us the habits and pollutions of Sin, and producing good works, is the obedience active and passive; the works, labours, sufferings, and satisfactions of Jesus Christ only, exclusive to the works, sufferings, or satisfactions of any other. Where also they maintain, that neither any works of our's, done by the meer strength of nature, have the least worth in them to procure God's assistant Grace, for the producing of any previous disposition to this Justification (as of Faith, Repentance, a love of God &c.) Nor again these dispositions, tho' wrought by assistant Grace, and having some supernatural dignity in them, have any such worth, as, by it to procure from God (setting aside his meer bonny and free promise) the Justification it self. 3.

3. *Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. 8. c. Nihil eorum que justificationem praeceperunt, sive fides, sive opera, ipsam justificationis gratiam promeretur.* Tis true that these dispositions to, or conditions of, man's Justification, as effected by Grace, having some true worth in them (tho' this no way comparable to the Acts produced by Grace inherent after Justification), and, besides having a gracious promise made to, or acceptance of, them (which two things none can deny) some Catholick Authors think, that this word *Meritum*, qualifying it with the addition *de congruo*, may be justly applyed to them (especially since St. Austin, and other Fathers, have so applied it formerly (St. Augt. Ep. 105, 106.) others think not; the matter agreed on, the difference is about words, and the Church's Subjects left to their liberty: See Bellarm. de Justific. I. l. 21. c. And see Head XVI. Merits.

3. Yet they next affirm: That there are some conditions or dispositions required of us, and also by God's free, first exciting, and then assisting, Grace (man's Will assenting and co-operating) wrought in us: Which, tho' by any worth of theirs

theirs they cannot merit, yet by virtue of God's free Promise, and the new Covenant, do certainly impertrate the applying (or if Protestants Will, imputing) to us both the active and passive Obedience of Christ, viz. all his Merits, which are accepted by God instead of, and as if they had been, our own: but this not as to our being esteemed by God our selves to have done them; { for none can truly be said, or thought, to have performed such righteousness, or satisfactions, that hath not done them himself, but another for him); but as to the benefit, or effect of them. *x.*

x. Bellarm. de Justificat. 2. l. 10.c. Dominus Jesus Christus justitia nostra, 1. Cor. 1. Quoniam satisfecit Patri pro nobis, & eam Satisfactionem ita nobis donat, & communicat, cum nos justificat, ut nostra satisfactio, & justitia dici potest: And a little after. Non esset absurdum, si quis diceret nobis imputari Christi justitiam, & merita, cum nobis donentur, & applicentur, ac si nos ipsi Deo satisfecissimus; modo non negetur, esse in nobis praeterea justitiam inherentem &c. Again, Ibid. 7. c. Si solum vellent, nobis imputari Christi merita [or justitiam] quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo Patri offerre pro peccatis nostris &c. Recta esset eorum sententia. Cap. 11. Potest sano modo accommodari exemplum Patriarche Iacob justitiae imputative, si quis dicat; oportere, ut induamus merita Christi [I add, or Justitiam, five obedientiam activam, Christi, for this also is part of his Merits,] (See Bellarm. de Christo, 5. l. 9. c initio) and illis quodammodo tecti, petamus a Deo indulgentiam peccatorum: nam solus Christus, pro peccatis nostris satisfacere potuit. I add, tam obedientia activa (See Rom. 5. 18, 19. Gal. 4. 4, 5. Phil. 2. 5. &c. Matt. 3. 15) quam passiva: and illa satisfactio nobis donatur, & applicatur, & nostra reputatur, cum Deo reconciliamur, & justificamur. Thorndike, Epilog. 2. l. 29. c. p. 248. 'The Supposition, that one man's doings or sufferings, may be personally, and immediately imputed to another man's account is utterly unreasonable. And I therefore must, and do, say; that as it is sufficient, so it is true, that the sufferings of Christ are imputed unto us in the nature of a meritorious cause, moving God to grant mankind those terms of Reconciliation, which the Gospel importeth.'

Not

Not all the benefit and effect in such a manner, as that whatever is any way due to the active or passive righteousness of Christ, is thus due to us: (for so we should all receive a future reward equal to one another; and also equal to that of Christ our Lord's); but all that benefit and effect of them, which our sinful condition stands in need of; and which God hath further thought fit to dispence, for the purchasing, (by an equal compensation and satisfaction) of our present pardon and future Glory. The benefit and reward of which merits, as to our glorification, he applies variously, according to the different degrees of our own present sanctity and good works, that dispose us for such a participation of these Merits. Such dispositions, produced by preventient and assistant Grace (in *adultis*) are a certain degree of Faith, or believing the truth of all the Divine Revelations and Promises; and particularly that of God's justifying the ungodly by his Grace, thro the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; the fear of God's judgments for Sin; hope and trust in his mercy thro Christ; love of his goodness; hate, and repentance, for former Sins; serious purpose of a better life, and oblervance of God's Commandments; and the desire, and susception (where opportunity) of Baptisme, the Sacrament instrumental hereunto. (See *Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. c.*) *44.* They grant, that among these previous dispositions or conditions of Justification, Faith is the beginning of the rest; and so the Foundation and root of all our Justification, and that without which it is impossible, in any other act, to please God. So, we neither fear God's Judgments; nor hope for his Pardon; nor love his Goodnes; nor put confidence in his only Son's Merits, unless we first believe these. And therefore St. Paul opposing the condition of the new Covenant [Faith, and all other acts, or works following it, as by God's promise to them, and not their own worth, applying Christ's Merits to us for our Justification] to the merits of the works of the Law, in the Jew; and of Nature in the Gentile: (but never oppposing Faith to any of those acts of Grace consequential, so long as these maintained, in no other manner, to concur to our Justification, than Faith it self doth; therefore most perfectly agreeeth with St. James. *a.*

Catholick THESES.

a. Mr. Thorndike, *Just Weights*, 9. c. p. 60. ‘To be justified by Faith alone is, with St. Paul, to be justified by Christianity alone. St. James in arguing that a Christian is justified by Works and not by Faith alone; intended to teach, that the profession of Christianity justifieth not, when it is not performed. Bishop Forbes de Justific. 4. l. 6. c. p. 173. *Sanctus Paulus intellexit semper ex fide viva, & quatenus viva, [i. e. operante vel externe vel interne per charitatem] nos justificari. Atque hoc ipsum est, quod Beatus Jacobus hic, sed Paulo clarus, & distinctius, affirmit; hominem ex operibus justificari, & non ex fide tantum.* The same thing appears from St. Paul’s Arguments made against Justification by Works, many of which are faulty, if made against Works following Faith, and wrought by Grace. As his arguing, *Rom. 4. 4. Rom. 4. 13.* compared with *2. 6. 1. Cor. 3. 13. 14. 1. Thess. 1. 10. Gal. 2. 21. -5. 4. -3. 13. Eph. 2. 8. 9. 10. Tit. 3. 4. 5. Phil. 3. 9.* compared with the precedent verses, *3. 4. 5. 6.* and with *Rom. 10. 3. -9. 31.* In all, or most of which, if instead of works of the Law, you read works of the formerly justified and pardoned their Sins by God’s meer mercy produced by Grace, that is procured by Christ’s merits, you will find the arguing and consequence invalid and faulty. This Apostle, I say, mentions this Faith more frequently than the rest; as being the very beginning, and first fruits of Divine Grace, and that without which none of the rest, that are added to it, either can be at all, or if being, can be any thing worth. μ.

b. Conc. Trid. Seff. 6. 8. c. *Cum vero Apostolus dicit, iustificari hominem per fidem; per fidem ideo iustificari dicimus, quia fides est humanae salutis initium, fundamentum, & radix omnis iustificationis; sine qua impossibile est placere Deo, & ad filiorum eius consortium pervenire.* Stapleton de Justificat. 8. l. c. ult. *Fide nos necessario vel ante omnia, & maxime iustificans, dum impius quidem iustificatur; quia a fide ordinandum est; Dum iustus autem iustificatur magis; quia omnia iustitiae opera in fide recta fieri, & a fide procedere debent.* Bellarm. de Justificat. 5. l. 7. c. *In homine nondum conciliato primus motus ad salutem est fidei; inde sequitur amor, & desiderium beatitudinis per fidem jam cognitam, post amorem sive cupiditatem Beatitudinis sequitur*

*sequitur in homine spes [Mediante reconciliatione] consequenda
ejusdem beatitudinis &c.*

5. This Faith therefore Catholicks maintain, That it may be said in this respect *primarily* to justify us (I mean by way of disposition, and condition required, and accepted, from us in order thereto.) But *say*, not it *solely*; either when it is not accompanied with the rest (for so it may be, but in such case is *injustificant*): or yet as if, when so accompanied, it alone, and not they, as well as it, and in the same manner as it, concurred to our *Justification*. For first, in the *Scriptures* frequently our *Justification* (*i. e.* pardon of Sin, and donation of Grace) is attributed as to it, so to them. See for *Repentance* (which also includeth fear) justifying, or procuring both remission of Sin, and renovation by the Spirit, the *Apostles Sermons* in the *Actis*, ch. 2. v. 38. *Repent* (saith *St. Peter*) *and be Baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of Sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* And Chap. 3. ver. 19. *Repent ye that your sins may be blotted out.* Chap. 5. ver. 31. *This Prince hath God exalted to give Repentance to Israel, and remission of Sins.* And Chap. 11. ver. 18. *Then hath God (say the Christians) also given to the Gentiles repentance unto life.* And *Luk. 24. 47.* Our Lord commandeth, *That Repentance and remission of Sin be preached in his Name unto all Nations;* And *Luk. 13. 3. 5.* telleth the People, *That without Repentance, they must perish* (See the same, *2. Pet. 3. 9. 1. Jo. 1. 9.* But if we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive them; in so much that it is agitated in the Schools, whether Faith, or Repentance, in our *Justification*, have, I say, not the first (for Repentance presupposeth Faith) but the principal, place. The same may be shewed of Love: *Luk. 7. 47.* *Much is forgiven her* (faith our Lord) *because she loved much.* And *1. Jo. 3. 14.* *We know that we are translated from death to life, because we love the brethren; he that loveth not, abideth in death.* And very frequently it is the reward of eternal Life particularly promised. See *1. Cor. 2. 9. Luk. 6. 35. Jam. 1. 12. 2. 5. Rom. 8. 28. 1. Cor. 16. 22.* The same promise of Remission of Sin, and eternal life made, yet more frequently, to Obedience, Reformation of

Life, works of Charity and Mercy. *Matt. 6. 15. If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will the Father forgive your trespasses.* *Matt. 5. 7. Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy.* *Acts, 10. 35. In every Nation, He that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.* *Heb. 6. 10. God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of Love.* *And 2. Tim. 4. 7, 8. The Lord, the just Judge, lays up a Crown of Righteousness for those who fight a good Fight.* *And Gal. 6. 7. Be not deceived [faith the Apostle St. Paul, speaking of good works] God is not mocked; what a man sows that shall he reap.* *And let no man deceive you (faith St. John, 1. Epist. c. 3. v. 7.) He that doth righteousness is righteous, even as he [our Lord Christ] is righteous.* Tis needless to name more. See St. Jam. c. 2. v. 21. &c. *Matt. 5. 1. Jo. 15. 14.* Nay not only by their deeds, but words also, men are justified, or condemned. *Matt. 12. 37.* The same promise made also to the receiving of the Sacraments. *Acts, c. 2. 28. - 22. 16. Eph. 5. 26. Tit. 3. 5, 6, 7.* This concerning the Expressions of Scripture.

2. As Faith may be conceived to justify us only by its relation to, and apprehension of, Christ's Merits; and not as it is a work of our's any way meriting of, it self our Justification, so also may all the rest of the forenamed dispositions. For by *Love and Hope*, built on Faith, we do yet more closely apprehend and apply these Merits, than we do by Faith alone; and as God is pleased to justify us by Christ's Merits, but not by these unknown to us, but that he first requires an eye of Faith that we see them; or if you will, a hand of Faith that we take, or lay hold of them: So he requires further the arms of Love to embrace them, and of Hope to hold them fast; and this, after that Repentance also with much importunity, and tears hath first procured our nearer access to them; otherwise whatever we think, our Faith without these, sees, or catcheth at them, but possesseth them not; and what greater opposition is there shewed to our meriting, by saying we are justified by Faith alone, and that relatively too, than that by Faith and other works of Grace; so long as we say; all, in their proper acts, only point at, and terminate in, the same Merits of Christ, not their own; as well as Faith doth? r.

r. Of

1. Of this matter well the Cardinal de *Justificatione*, Lib. 1.
 16. Cap. *Esto, apprehendatur aliquo modo justificatio per fidem,*
certe non ita apprehenditur, ut res ipsa jam habeatur, & inbarcat;
sed solum, ut sit in mente per modum objecti, actione intellectus,
aut voluntatis, apprehensi: at hoc modo apprehendunt etiam amor
& gaudium, ut scribit St. Augustinus in Lib. 8. Conf. cap. 2.
Ubi de Victorino loquens: volebant eum, inquit, omnes rapere in
corsum & rapiebant amando, & gaudendo. Haec rapientium
manus erant. Dr. Fern, Answer to Scripture Mistaken, 4. c.

p. 92. ‘Albeit good Works do not justify, but follow Justification, yet are there many works, or workings of the Soul required in, and to Justification. Again, These works, or workings of the Soul [naming there desire, fear, love, sorrow, purposes,] are preparatory, and dispositive to Justification. And *Eccl. 24.* There are other acts, and works also, besides Faith, which according to their measure are required in Justification, as conditions of receiving remission of Sins; so, Repentance, and the act of Charity in forgiving others. Bishop *Patres de Justificat. I. l. 4. c. Sacre littere*
nunquam nec adjecti, nec per necessarium consequentiam, fidei
Soli omnem animo vim justificandi tribuunt; scilicet quod idem est,
asserunt fidem esse unicum instrumentum, & medium accipieendi,
& apprehendendi gratia justificationis. Ibid. *Patres plurimi*
nos Sola fidei justificari affirmant. Sed si pura mente Eccl. legeris,
claro videtur per vocem (Sola) Patres omnia simpliciter faci &
gratia opera a causa justificationis, & salutis exteriori nunquam
excludere voluisse. Sed primo legem naturae & Mosaicam.
Secundo opera omnia propriis viribus, sine fide in Christianum,
& gratia Dei praeveniente facta. Tertio salam fidem, vel heresim,
qui super fidem, non autem operibus opponunt. Quarto: Operibus
externorum etiam ex gratia factorum, ut charitatis, penitentiae,
Sacramentorum perceptionis &c; necessitatem absolutam, quando
scilicet aut potestas, aut occasio deest eismodi opera facienda; tam
enim sufficit Sola fides sine operibus externis. Sed non, sine omni
bono affectu penitentiae & dilectionis in Deum, que opera sunt
interna. Denique quinto: omnem inanem fiduciam operum no-
strorum. Sive interne, sive externe factorum. Cap. 5. §. 14.
Primum censemus omnem rigorum Protostaurum sententiam,
& a veritate, & a charitate Christiana, alienam esse; qui assert-
sionem

tionem de sola fide non justificante communiter a Romanensibus defensam, citra omnem vel fidei ipsius vel meriti opinionem, etiam improprie dicti, vel aliorum operum, seu actuum cum fide ad justificationem concurrentium, non solum cum sancta Scriptura & piis Patribus e diametro pugnare contendunt; sed etiam, præter alia innumera, justam Protestantibus a Romana Ecclesia secedendi causam praenuisse, & prebtere. Dr. Hammond Praet. Catech. 1. I. §. 4. p. 75. The necessary qualifications, conditions, or moral instruments of our Justification, are Faith, Repentance, firm purpose of a new life, and the rest of those Graces, upon which in the Gospel, pardon is promised the Christian. And afterwards. 'This kind of Sanctification [so he calls the dispositions to Justification, wrought in us by God's Grace] is precedent in order of nature to Justification, i. e. I must first believe, repent, and return, before God will pardon.'

6. They affirm also, that one may have a true faith or belief of all the Articles of our Creed, and particularly of this, *man's Redemption through Christ's Merits*, or (if we take Faith for fiducia) may have also a fiducial confidence, that he in particular shall obtain, or (if you will) hath already obtained, remission of his Sins, through the same redemption and merits; and yet not by this Faith, or fiducia attain Justification, if these be not accompanied with Repentance, and the other necessary preparations thereto. For there are many wicked and irregenerate men; who yet do truly believe all the Articles of the Creed, and are thereby fully convinced of their duty (yet led away with lusts do contrary to what they know they ought) and some of them, who are also fully (tho' groundlessly, for want of Repentance, and the other requisites) persuaded, that themselves are of the number of the justified. ¶

7. Thorndike, Epilog. 2. I. p. 28. 'It is manifest to all Christians, that there are too many in the world, whom we cannot imagine to have any due title to those promises, and yet do really and verily believe the Faith of Christ to be true; and him, and his Apostles, sent from God to preach it. And [from their belief] stand convict, that they ought to proceed accordingly. [yet] We see men not always to do that, which

'which reasonably [from their belief] they ought to do &c.
Again on the other side; 'Trust and confidence in God through
'Christ obtains the promises of the Gospel, who denies it?
'But is this trust always well grounded and true? Is it not
'possible for a man to imagine his title to the promises of the
'Gospel to be good when it is not? I would we had no cause
'to believe, how oft it comes to pass.

All which argues, these other Acts are necessary concur-
rents to Justification, as well as such Faith; For it seems very
unreasonable, that such Faith, when without the other (as ma-
ny times it is) is effectless as to attaining Justification; and
yet, when it is with them, they effectless, and it doing the
whole; especially if the former Scriptures be reviewed using
the same expressions of their concurrence to this effect, as they
do of Faith.

7. Our Justification [i.e. remission of Sin, and infusion
of habitual Grace (which Infants also when baptized re-
ceive as well as others) whereby we are made new creatures,
and by the infusion of his Holy Spirit born of God, and his
Seed remaining in us, and so made his Sons, and Heirs] be-
ing thus attained upon our Faith, and the other foremen-
tioned dispositions required in us. Next Catholicks grant:
That the thus justified, not only have a right to, but may
also attain the possession of eternal life, before, and without
external good works issuing from such habitual or inherent
Grace: or before any justification or merit by them. And
that their works are not necessary to justification (the pro-
ducing or continuing of it;) or to the obtaining the reward
of it, eternal life, when either power, as in those who as
yet have not the use of reason, or who are prevented by
sudden death) or an occasion of such good works is want-
ing; or also, when occasion being offered, yet the omission
of such good works amount not to a mortal Sin; by which Sins
only man falls from his former Justification. &c.

But say, They affirm, which is also allowed by Learned
Protestants. *

as Dr. Field, Append. to 3. I. 11. c. In Answer to Dr. Staple-
ton's Words. 'That Actions of Virtue, and careful endeav-
our

'vour to walk in the Commandments of God, are not necessary to our second Justification, or the augmentation, progress, and dayly perfecting of the same more and more, is a Calumnyation; for they [the Protestants] make the second Justification to consist in two parts. 1/1, The dayly well-doing, whereby the righteousness inherent is more and more perfected: And 2/y, the dayly remission of such sinful defects, as are found in their actions. Dr. Fern, *Answer to Scripture Mistaken*, p. 92. 'If they intend no more by second Justification than is here expressed in the Trent Decree: viz. Renovation day by day, and yielding up our Members as Weapons of Righteousness to Sanctification, and increase in Righteousness; we have no cause to quarrel at the thing; but only that they will call that Justification, which indeed is Sanctification. Bishop Forbes de *Justificat.* 4 l. 6. c. *Perperam a Protestantibus rigoribus rejicitur distinctio usitissima justificationis in primam & secundam. Nam [preter Justificationem primam] necessario estiam agnoscenda, & admittenda est justificatio secunda, que consistit in progressu, augmentatione, & complemento (pro statu vite) justitie primum donata, & in remissione illorum delictorum, in qua quotidie justi incident.* Confirming it there with several Protestant Authorities.

That this first Justification, thus attained before these good Works, is, in case of longer life, both necessarily continued by good Works, or acts of inherent Grace either external or only internal, where is some impediment of the external, (so that he who commits a mortal Sin in omission of such works falls from his former Justification); and also is increased; or further degrees of Justification, or inhabitante Grace, or (as the Protestants had rather call it) *Sanctification*, received, or added, by the same good works; (for such acts external or internal do still increase the habit, or render the person more holy); whereby the already just is still made more just, (so Abraham, tho just before, yet was more highly justified by that Heroick act of the Oblation of his only Son, *Ian. 2.*): And the future reward also becomes greater to these good Works, according to our greater Justification by them. For if some more imperfect acts of Faith, of Repentance, Hope, Love, &c. done only by God's assistant Grace, did tho God's

God's promise, and Christ's merits, procure our first Justification, and the consequents thereof; much more the same acts, and others the like, now more perfect, and proceeding from Grace inhabitant, do, thro the same promise and merits, confer on, or procure for, us a greater or (as some stile it) a second Justification, viz. An improvement of our former justice, the remission of such Venial Sins as are still committed by the justified, and a richer eternal reward.

9. They affirm; That a man may fall away again from this state of Justification by incurring those greater Sins, either of Omission or Commission, which are for this cause, called commonly, *Mortal*; from which fall he is capable of restoration to a second Justification, or justified condition by the same means, as he attained the first; only if, instead of Baptisme not iterable, he make use of the Sacrament of Penance for his entrance into it, where-in concerning the just value and virtue of Penal Works, see below, Head XIX.

10. These are the Catholicks Positions concerning Justification, much tending to the promotion of pious endeavours, and an holy life; with whom also the more moderate Protestants, do in most, if not all, the former Points, concur. But meanwhile there are other Tenents of the more rigid Protestants on this subject (and several also of them broached, by the first Author of the Reformation, which brings a very great prejudice to it) that tend much to the relaxation of good manners, the breeding of false securities, and weakening mens endeavours in the prosecution of a good life: such as these 3.

3. See the most rigid Protestants, maintaining the most of these Opinions, cited and censured by Bishop *Forbes* in his *Considerations aequæ & placide de Justificatione*. And by Dr. *Hammond* in his *Treatise of Fundamentals*, from the 11th to the 19th Chapter. And by Mr. *Thornalike*, *Epilog. 2. l.* from the 4th to the 10th Chapter.

1st. Their placing Justification only in the remission of Sin, and imputation to us of the righteousness of Christ; not in infusion of Grace, or renovation of life, making men fancy, here, that all their work is done for, and without them; none to be done in or by them. 2dly, In such remission of Sin, their

making Justification, as it were one momentaneous act, and God at one and the same time remitting to us all our Sins past present, and to come; which must needs produce afterward a very careless behaviour, both to committing and repenting of Sin. 3^y, In such imputation of Christ's Righteousness; their maintaining it in such a manner, not as if we were meritoriously justified, by the application of the effects of it to us, as if it had been our own; but formally justified by a translation of it, and investiture with it, in such a manner, as if it were inherent in us, and esteemed to be done by ourselves. 4^y, From whence ariseth also a conceit; that all men by this righteousness (apprehended by their Faith) are equally justified: or all esteemed equally righteous in their Justification. 5^y, And so also, that all become equal in the future celestial reward, whether working much or working little. 6^y, Their making the only instrument, or necessary condition required in us for Justification, or remission of Sin, Faith alone (an easy act of the brain (as Dr. *Hammond*, *Of Fundamentals*, p. 116. observes) having nothing in it repugnant to our passions, and not any other good disposition wrought in us by God's especial Grace; Repentance, purpose of a better Life, &c; and this Faith too required of us for this purpose, not as any work, or duty, but only as an instrument or hand to apprehend, and apply Christ's merits to us, and to make his righteousness ours, &c. 7^y, Their making this Faith that justifies us, a strong *fides* or full assurance that we are justified (or if you will that we shall be justified) only on those terms, if we firmly believe we shall be so. Which obliging men of what life soever, to believe they are, or shall be, justified, without looking after any requisite thereto, save only this full belief, renders those who continue still unreformed in their Manners, yet (by such strong fancy) secure of their Salvation; whilst none more than they extol the all-sufficiency of Christ's Righteousness; nor none so much as they do, or have reason to, despise in, and dis-esteem their own. From which Tenent also it follows; that all those that are truly justified, are assured, or certainly know that they are justified; The ordinary effect of which Doctrine is, despair in some, who find in themselves no such assurance

assurance certain; presumption in others, who are fully assured without just cause. 8th, Their holding that a justifying is only a true Faith; which breeds a great presumption in those for their being also justified persons, who do, and have no reason but to, take themselves for true believers; and who would even give their bodies to be burnt for any Article of the Christian Faith (1. Cor. 13. 3.) and yet do, or may want Charity; and so, Justification. 9th, Their holding good works and the other dispositions, that always accompany a justified Faith to be necessary to our Justification, or Salvation, only as effects, and fruits, or also signs and assurances, to ourselves, or others of this Faith; necessary for their presence indeed; but not for their efficiency; as *cuncta sine quan-*
non, ad salutem non impediendum &c.; but not as instruments, or conditions required thereto as our Faith is: thus destroying obedience it self, by taking away the chief motives that men have to it, and making them neglect any further pains-taking, for the production of those things, which they are taught do necessarily grow from Faith: or which serve only to justify them, not before God, but Men. 10th, Their expounding St. Paul, not only to exclude Works performed by strength of Nature, but done by Grace, from any way dispensing us, or concurring thereto: And St. James, only to speak of good Works, as declaring our Justification before men, not obtaining it with God. 11th, Their affirming the Promises of the Gospel to be merely gratuital (excepting for Faith), and not conditional upon Obedience, as those of the Law were, denying our Lord to be any Legislator; or denying Christian liberty to be so far obliged to the Obedience of the Law, as that any account is had of our observing of it in any degree, as to obtaining, or improving, our Justification: And that Christians ought now, not as tied to it by God's Law, but spontaneously and freely, to do that Will of his, which was formerly made known to them by the Law. Which Obedience of ours, how little soever, (and upon such terms we may guess it will not be much) yet is accepted by God through the more perfect Obedience of his Son, made ours by Faith. (See *Calvin, Institutiones*, 3. l. 19. c. 2. 4. §.) And then we may guess what a poor harvest there will be of good Works where they

are, thus only Free-will-offerings. 12^{ly}, Their depressing the righteousness, and true worth, of good Works, flowing from Grace infused; and by this undervaluing the true Power of God's Grace given unto us; and so by this again inconsiderately, lessening the effects of Christ's merits also, as purchasing this infusion of Grace whereby to forbear sinning; as much as they seem to extol them, in the pardoning of us, whilst doing nothing but sinning; lessening also the same merits in the removing of Sin; whilst they make it in their Justification rather covered, than the strength and habit deleted, and eradicated: misapplying *Rom. ch. 7.* 13^{ly}, Their affirming, that the pretended restoring of the once justified and afterwards fallen from Grace, to the State of Grace again, taught and used in the Church, is a thing merely imaginary. (See Dr. Field, *Append. 3. I. p. 312:*) for that he who is once justified, can never be unjustified; and who are once assured of their Justification, are also assured of perseverance in it, happen afterwards what sin will happen. Which sins also (consequently) tho' of the same kind must not be, in these persons, of the same guilt, as in others: i. e. losing the Kingdom of Heaven, (*1. Cor. 6.*) and so these persons being indeed (though they persuade themselves otherwise) by such sins, fallen from Grace. Now are the Keys of the Church, and those Sacraments, and such a measure of repentance, neglected, whereby they might have been restored; and so the last state of these men worse than the first [that before their justification]: and their end miserable, because too much conceited, and secure. These are the Tenents of some more rigid Protestants in the Point of Justification in opposition to the Roman Doctrines. In some of which, if perhaps, their meaning may, by a charitable construction, be reconciled to truth; yet do their expressions seem very pernicious to a good life; and easily misunderstood by the vulgar, or those who take them in the most obvious sense.

H E A D . XVI.

Of Merit.

COncerning the Merits of Grace inhabitant, or of the good Works that proceed from it. 1. Catholicks do generally disclaim any merit of them, in such a sense, as the word *Merit* is explained by Protestants (See *Field, Append. 3.1. p. 324. Forbes de Justifica. 5. l. 3. c. p. 197.*) viz. First, *Ut opus sit nostrum non ejus, a quo mercedem expectamus.* 2ly, *Ut sit in-debitum.* 3ly, *Ut nihil unquam faciendum omittatur, nec omit-tendum committatur, sive quoad partes, sive gradus.* 4ly, *Ut sit equalitas inter opus & mercedem.* Or yes as Merit is taken in the former Covenant of Works involving the first and third of these Conditions. They willingly granting; That as there are no works of our's done by Grace afflstant, tho having some worth in them, that can merit our Justification; so neither any Works of the already justified, proceeding from Grace infused, and inhabitant, tho having yet a greater worth in them, that can merit the future divine reward promised to them, as *condigne*; i.e. as any way, in strict justice, equalling it. a.

Bellar. de Justific. 3. l. 14. c. Opera, bona si considerentur ex natura sua, remota promissione & dignitate principii operantis, nullam habent proportionem ad beatitudinem illam supernatu-alem. prouide non eis debetur ex justitia merces aeternae vite; quoting *Rom. 8. 18. Luk. 19. 17. Matt. 19. 29. centuplum 2. Cor. 4. 17.* and in his using the Phrase *ex condigno* (for this reason, because their Works have not only a promise made to them of a reward, but also a dignity, by reason of the divine principle of them, God's Grace in us, that hath some correspondence, or similitude to the reward; as the Seed to the fruit; a lesser degree of Grace here, to a higher measure there-of here, and hereafter in the next world), yet he dis-claims any equality in a sense strictly taken; as most clearly appears

appears in his answer to the Objection made against condignity; viz. the great inequality of our present Works (tho proceeding from Grace), and life eternal; especially, taken for the Object thereof: *Deus merces nostra magna nimis*; as also the inequality of the imperfect knowledge, and charity we have here, to that perfect, we shall receive for it hereafter. To which he answers, *Ibid. c. 18.* *Negari non potest,* *quoniam beatitudo longe excellat actioni meritoria, cum in illa sit cognitio, & charitas perfecta, in ista vero sit cognitio, & charitas imperfecta.* And, That, *Non requiritur absoluta equalitas inter meritum & premium secundum iustitiam distributivam;* ut dicit possit premium ex condigno, etiam ex parte operis; sed sufficit, ut sit proportio quaedam, secundum quam is, qui meretur, dicit possit dignus ex premio. And, That,—*Ideo dicimus ex condigno debet fidei formatio per charitatem visionem cum ardentiissima charitate; quia dignum est, ut res a Deo inchoata & disposita, tandem aliquando perficiatur & absolvatur.* Granting also there, that God doth always, *remunerare iustorum opera supra condignum.* This account, gives this Cardinal, of the Word *Condignum.* See the like in *Scotus, I. l. 17. d. 1. q.* *Premium* [speaking of *eterna beatitudo*] *est maius bonum merito;* & *iustitia stricta non reddit mehas premium bono;* *ideo bene dicimus quod Deus semper premiat ultra meritum condignum.* See more Testimonies tending to this purpose below [+] and *Head Letters*, *x. q. r. v. q.*

Or, Secondly. As *nossa*, or *ex nobis*; or 3ly, As *indebita* y. 1. or 4ly, All of them, *quod partes, & gradus*, perfect and free from faults (See *Head XV.* of *Justification.*) Further also conceding, that these good Works in order to that meriting, which is by Catholicks ascribed to them, do stand in need of the supply, or support, of the Merits of our Lord; and that in many several respects. 1ly, Both for procuring the gift of that Grace to us, which in us procures or produceth these good Works, &c. 2ly, And for procuring the Past and Promise, which God hath made to them; without which whatsoever their worth had been, they could have claimed from God no such reward. 3ly, And for the remission of the imperfections and Venial Sins accompanying many of them, pardoned to us for Christ's, not their, Merit (See *Head XV.*) 4ly, And lastly,

Iy, For the exhibiting to God an Obedience which in its true worth equalizeth, or (if you will) exceeds the reward; for Catholicks affirm a meritorious cause, as of our Justification, so of our Glorification perfectly equalling life eternal, and the highest degrees therof which any one receiveth; but this not in us, or our Works ; but in Christ; the effect of whose merits is dispensed to us for this end according to the measure of these our Works; which (as the Council of Trent, Sess. 14. 8. c.) *Ex illo vobis habent; ab illo offeruntur Patri;* & per illum acceptantur a Patre. And Ibid. Can. 26. *Justus pro bonis operibus expectat retributionem eternam, per Christi merita.* (See *Vulg. I. 2. P. 214. c. 1, 2.*) Catholicks therefore affirm: 1. That, whatsoever worth there may be in the works of the Justified, yet since we are not sufficient of our selves to do, or think, any good thing as of our selves; but our sufficiency is of God; (See 2. Cor. 3. 5. Jo. 15. 5. —3. 27. 1. Cor. 4. 17. —12. 16. Jam. 1. 17. —2. Cor. 12. 11. Gal. 6. 3. Luk. 17. 10.) His Grace in every thing first preventing us, and exciting us to them, and also necessarily helping us in every part of them, and man's Will only attending, and, as it is guided, co-operating with it; therefore this their worth is justly to be ascribed to God's Grace, the first and principal agent herein, not to us (*nossa vobis est merita, que ipsius sunt dona.* (Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. 16. c.) When therefore Catholicks any way advance the Dignity of such Works, they only extol God's Grace and Spirit within us, whilst others his Grace, and favour only without us; whilst others, the Works of Christ for us; they the Works of Christ also in us. *¶*

b. Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. 16. c. Tanta est Domini erga omnes homines bonitas ut corum velit esse merita, que sunt ipsius dona. Bellarm. de Justifica. I. I. 19. c. *Operibus, que sunt ex gratia, id quod redditur non est simpliciter merces, sed etiam gratia, immo magis gratia, quam merces.* To which purpose also St. Austin, Epist. 105. *Etiam ipsa [vita eterna] gratia nuncupatur non ob aliud, nisi quia gratis datur; nec ideo quia meritis non datur, sed quia data sunt & ipsa merita, quibus datur.*

From

From whom, as his members and branches, we receive all our Virtue, as from our Root and Head: Nor we any more live, but Christ in us. &c. Secondly, They grant, that whatever degree or worth, or condignity to a reward these good works should have, yet that they cannot *merit* or *claim* the least reward from God without the intervening, first of a pact, and his free promise of such reward: they cannot *merit from him*; because all things whatever by the right of Creation, and again of our Redemption, are already *his own* and due to him. 2. 1.

2. 1. F. Fisher in Bishop White, p. 517. 'God might wholly require the good Works we do as his own [i.e. without paying the least reward to them] by many titles of Justice, being Works of his Servants: Of Religion, being Works of his Creatures: Of Gratitude, being Works of persons infinitely obliged to him [viz. in our Preservation, Redemption, Sanctification, &c.] Bellarm. de Justific. 5. 1. 14. c. Cum simus omnes conditione servi & mancipia Dei, non potest esse justitia inter nos & Deum, nisi ipse libera conventione operibus nostris aliqui debitis, etiam si nulla merces illis reddenda esset, premium constitueret voluisse. Quoting there Luk. 17. Cum feceritis haec omnia, dicite, servi inutiles sumus. And, St. Bernard: Totum ergo quod es, illi debes, natus totum habes. Applying this *debitum* to our good Works universally, not only those acts of Christian Virtues that are *sub precepto*, in omitting which in just time and place we sin, and are made liable to punishment; but also those higher and intense acts of the same Virtues that are *sub consilio* recommended to us by our Lord, not commanded: or commanded for the attaining of perfection, but not for our not incurring sin, or punishment in disobeying them. Que observata majus habent premium, non observata nullam habent penam. (De Monach. 2. 1. 7. c.) for which see De Monach. 2. 1. 13. c. Potuit Deus a nobis exigere quicquid possumus, non tamen voluit. Nunquam potest homo sacre plus quam debet, immo etiam nec quantum debet, si consideremus beneficia Dei nobis collata; & tamen possumus facere plus quam debemus, si consideremus Legem nobis impositam [i.e. such Law, in not observing which we are held guilty of Sin] & perinde possumus facere plus, quam revera facere teneamus.

And

And particularly, the whole worth of these good Works from his special Grace. Nor *2dly*, can they claim, were they none of *his* already, *any such reward from him*; because nothing from its mere worth can oblige another to purchase or reward it, or give to the owner thereof its just price, unless some bargain or obligation hath preceded. *y. 2.*

y. 2. Bellarm. de Justific. 5. l. 14. c. *Neque enim opus aequalis mercedi potest vel ex justitia commutativa, vel distributiva, praeferim, ubi quis propria bona distribuit, alterum obligare, nisi conventio & pactum ante praecesserit.*

3dly, Catholicks affirm; That man, in his Justification being now regenerated, and made a new Creature, and a partaker of the Divine Nature, born of God, and his Seed abiding in him; receiving as a true Member of Christ, a continual, celestial Virtue, and influence from this Head; and as a branch the juice of this Vine; receiving the Signature, the earnest and first fruits of that Holy Spirit now presently, of which he shall have the more plentiful harvest hereafter; which Spirit in him already a fountain of living water springing unto life eternal; (See 2. Cor. 5. 17. — 2. Pet. 1. 4. Jo. 1. 13. — 15. 5. — 2. Cor. 1. 22. — 5. 5. Eph. 1. 14. Rom. 8. 23. Eph. 4. 3. Jo. 4. 14.) Catholicks, I say, affirm, that this Seed of God in him, and its fruits, good Works, which God works in him (Phil. 2. 13. Heb. 13. 21.) must needs have a certain divine and supernatural goodness, worth, and dignity in them, well pleasing, and of a sweet smelling savour to God; and the persons doing them children of light, truly beloved of, and most acceptable and dear to, him, as now his Sons, and bearing his own image; (Phil. 4. 18. Eph. 5. 8. Col. 3. 10.) and these their actions just, pure, lovely, praise-worthy (Phil. 4. 8.) done to God's glory (1. Cor. 10. 3.) resembling and like unto his. *Sanctificantes se, sicut & ille Sanctus est, (1. Jo. 3.) & imitatores Dei ut filii Charissimi, (Eph. 5. 1.)* *s.*

4. Acknowledged also by sober Protestants. Bishop *White* against *Fisher*, p. 170. ‘The Works of the Regenerate are truly good, because they proceed from the Holy Ghost; good in regard of their object, form, efficient, and end, Psal.

Catholick THESES.

118. 167. *Gal. 5. 22. Phil. 2. 13. -1. Cor. 10. 31.* They are
 'good Fruits opposed to evil Fruits, *Matt. 7. 17.* Works of
 'Light opposed to Works of Darkness, *Eph. 5. 9.* a spiritual
 'Sacrifice, acceptable to God, *Phil. 4. 18.* And the same are
 'truly good *comparatione Scelerum;* not comparatively only,
 'but *Regula Virtutum,* according to the Rule of Virtue.
August. c. 2. Ep. Pelag. Lib. 4. c. 10. and p. 174. 'There
 'is in all good Works a dignity of Grace, Divine similitude,
 'goodness, and honour, *Phil. 4. 8.*

44. Affirm also, this worth of the actions of the Regenerate, after Justification, much different from, and transcendent to, that worth, which is in the former dispositions precedent to Justification; done indeed by the external help of God's Grace, but before the transfusion into us of his Spirit. But this always to be remembred; that no worth of the one, or the other, is from our selves, as of our selves; but the worth of them is from God. They affirm, accordingly, that there is in these Works of the justified, proceeding in us from this Divine Principle, a worth and similitude some way proportionable, and corresponding to the reward promised to them; in respect of which worth, Life eternal, and the beatifical Vision of God, and all the consequences thereof, are called the Wages, and Stipend, Reward, Prize, and Crown, of these Works; *Matt. 5. 12. Apoc. 22. 12. Matt. 20. 8. -2. Tim. 4. 8. Apoc. 2. 10. -1. Cor. 9. 24, 25.* And they said truly to merit such reward, according to the sense of the word *Merit* used by the Fathers, and the word *Dignity* used in the Scriptures. (a chief portion of which reward, as a greater measure of God's Spirit; and Charity, and Sanctification in the most intense degree, received in the next world; and the augmentations of Grace daily received in this, are only higher degrees of the same kind, and nature, with that, of which they are the reward.) And God also is said to give such rewards to these, *ex justitia;* & *quia digni sunt,* (*Apoc. 3, 4. -2. Thess. 1. 5. Heb. 6. 10. -2. Tim. 4. 8.*) not only in this respect that God is just and faithful in keeping his promise, once made, tho to a Service of little or no worth at all; but in respect of some valuable goodness, and worth (tho this from God) also in the condition it self, to which he makes the promise of such

such reward. They rationally affirm also, that whatever benefit any ones Sanctity or good Works may be said, by way of impetration, to procure from God for others, they may be said also to have the same power with God for themselves; when by relapse into sin, or falling into any necessity or misery themselves are in the same condition as such others; and when their ingratitude, and affront and contempt of former Grace &c. doth not aggravate their offence and fall beyond that of others. See 2. Chron. 9. 3. Nebem. 13, 14, 22, 31.

54. Yet this worth of the Righteousness, or works of the justified, whatever it it be, as it hath its original not from us, but from God, and is also, without any purchase thereof, wholly due to him, from us his Creatures and Vassals; so is it not affirmed to ascend so high, as any way to equal those rewards promised to it, but to be far inferior, and God ever to reward beyond any such Merit. (Matt. 25. 22. - 2. Cor. 4. 17.) For whereas our good Works momentary are not only said to merit Life eternal, but also to merit those higher measures of the Holy Spirit, and degrees of Sanctification, that shall be conferred on us there, as also the the increase of Grace, in this life; here it is manifest, that the lesser degree (the Merit); and the greater, (the reward) cannot be equalled in their worth. Some proportion, some similitude there is between this Seed the justified sow here, and the Fruits thereof they reap hereafter, sufficient to support the Phraze (especially after the intervening of a Pact) of the one meriting, or being worthy of the other; but not to maintain in commutative justice, one of equal value, or worth, to the other. This we have title to by Christ's Merits only, not our Works; to the which Merits also we owe, that we have these Works; therefore the Council of Trent, that admits *meritum bonorum operum ex pacto*, and so *ex justitia &c.* yet waves the expression *ex condigno*, as liable to Mistakes. 6.

6. Bellarm. de Justificat. 3. l. 16 c. *Catholici omnes agnoscent opera bona iustorum esse meritoria vita eternae, sed tamen aliqui censent non esse utendum his vocibus, de condigno, & de congruo; sed absolute dicendam, opera bona iustorum esse meritoria vita eternae, ex gratia Dei.*

Bishop *White*, Answer to *Fisher*, p. 172. (and the same p. 312.) ‘The Opinion of Modern Papists (saith he) concerning the Merit of Condignity was always opposed by Pontificians themselves, *Scotus*, *Durand*, *Marsilius*, *Dionysius*, *Cisterciensis*, *Gregory Ariminien*, *Thomas Walden*, *Paulus Burgensis*, *Job. Ferus*, *Eckius*, *Pigbius*, &c. [and see many more later added by Bishop *Forbes de Justificat.* 3. l. 4. c. which I mention here to shew a liberty of Opinion herein left to her Subjects by the Roman Church:] and many, who propugne the Doctrine of Merit of Condignity, speak improperly. Thus Bishop *White*. Mr. *Thorndike*, Epilog. 2. l. 33. c. p. 308. ‘As it cannot be denied that the Church of *Rome* allows this Doctrine of Merit [he means of Condignity] to be taught; yet can it not be said to enjoyn it: Because there have not wanted to this day Doctors of esteem that have always held otherwise. Again, They who only acknowledge *Meritum congrui* in Works done in the state of Grace (*i. e.* that it is fit for God to reward them with his Kingdome) say no more, than that it was fit for God to promise such a reward; which who so denieth must say, that God hath promised that which was unfit for him to promise. And if the Dignity of our Works in respect of the reward, may have this tolerable sense, because God daigns and vouchsafes it [such reward] the Council of *Trent*, which hath enacted no reason why they are to be counted Merits, can neither bear out these high Opinions, [he means maintained by some of the Roman Authors] nor be said to prejudice the Faith in this point. Again, ‘That which necessarily comes in consideration with God, in the bestowing the reward (which the condition he contracted for, must necessarily do) tho it cannot have the nature of Merit [*i. e.* taken in a Protestant sense] (because the Covenant it self is granted meerly of Grace in consideration of Christ’s death), yet it is of necessity to be reduced to the nature and kind of the Meritorious Cause. Nor can the Glory of God, or the Merit of Christ, be obscured by any consideration of our Works, that is grounded upon the Merit of our Lord Christ, and expresseth the tincture of his Blood; [as all the Roman Merit professedly doth.]

And

And so do many Roman Authors, both before, and since the Council. And also most of those other that use this Phrase, to signify some true worth in these Works, as before explained. *Tbes. 3, 4* yet so qualify it, as that it can offend no rational Protestant.

6^{ly}, That therefore, first, he who conceits, any good works of the justified are, or may be such, as may challenge from God's justice life eternal, save only upon his free and gracious promise, made to them; or at least in commutative justice, do deserve it, from any worth in them, that equals it; and, for both these doth not always depend only on the Merits of Christ, is held by Catholicks to err from Truth; and to be guilty of a most false presumption. 2^{ly}, For the true concurrence, that good Works have by Christ's Merits thro God's free promise, for obtaining or meriting life eternal; here also, as every one ought in general to believe most certainly, and infallibly, that all who perform such Evangelical Obedience, shall obtain life Eternal: So they affirm; 1st, That none is obliged to believe specially, that his own Works, or Obedience is such, as cannot miss of it; or that if he have not a full perswasion of the merit of his own Works, or of his own Justification, or Salvation, or of the particular application of Christ's Merits to himself, he cannot be justified, or saved, or partake of his Merits. 2^{ly}, That by reason of the liableness of the once justified by, or in, their Baptisme to fall away again, by committing Mortal Sin, from their Justification: and then, the difficulty of discerning exactly among their Sins committed, what are Mortal and losing the Divine Grace, what are not: then again, by reason of the difficulty of knowing in our regaining a second Justification, when we have a sufficient repentance, or sorrow, and contrition for our former Sins (without which the Churches Sacraments do not profit us, and a different measure of which is required according to the greatness of our fault) and when we have not: And 3^{ly}, by reason, If we were ascertained of our regained estate; of the great alloy, and impairment which our actions, in this estate, may receive from the mixture of many Venial sins; so that our faults do many times equal, sometimes exceed, our good deeds; nay sometimes that which we think a good act, is no better.

better than a true, tho Venial Sin; and is augmented also in our presumption that it is none: By reason also of the difficulty to distinguish between Evangelical Counsels, and Precepts; in respect of which, a different observance is required, under penalty of falling into some Mortal Sin, or only failing of Perfection: And lastly, by reason of the uncertainty of our perseverance, and that our present Merits or Piety may not be all evacuated by some future miscarriages: I say by reason of all these, Catholicks affirm it the safest course, especially for those who have not attained to any great perfection, not to put any, or much, least it should happen to be a mistaken, confidence in any merit, or sufficiency of their own present works to those ends, for which God requireth them of us. But rather wholly to trust in, and rely on, God's mercy, both for our present condition; that, if it be not safe, he will, through Christ's Merits, by improving our Faith, and Repentance, change and amend it; and for our present actions; when we are in a safe condition; that if they be full of defects and miscarriages, he will for Christ's Merits, remit these, and for the future more sanctify them, and give us also perseverance in them. We ever rememb'ring that of the Apostle, 1. Cor. 4. 4. *Nibil mibi conscient sum, sed non in hoc iustificatus sum, quis autem judicat me, Dominus est.* Of which matter thus the Council of Trent, Sess. 6. c. 9. *Sicut nemo pius de Dei misericordia, Christi Meritis, Sacramentorum virtute, & efficacia, dubitare potest: Sic quilibet, dum seipsum suamque propriam infirmitatem & indispositionem respicit, de sua gratia [i.e. of his Regeneration] formidare, & timere potest.* Yet lastly, they grant; That such justified, as are eminent in Sanctity, both may have by special revelation (which God sometimes condescending to a great familiarity communicates unto them) an infallible certainty of their present Justification, and (if persevering) Salvation; and may also without such revelation, tho not attain any infallible certainty or persuasion, *cui non potest subesse falsum*, by reason of the possible defect of their judgment about some of the aforesaid particulars (upon which therefore can never be built any Divine Faith; the object of which is only Divine Revelation, and therefore that only which is absolutely

lutely infallible), yet have a strong and moral-certain persuasion, or faith, *cui non sub-est dubium, or dubitatio*; may have a fearless and calm security, that they are actually justified, and consequently (if persevering) shall be glorified. Which is called the Testimony of a good Conscience, grounded on their present Obedience, as the condition and service required of them, for rendering them capable, of such a reward, and of Christ's most perfect obedience the adequate merititious cause thereof. (See 2. Cor. 1. 12. —1. Jo. 3. 18, 19, 20. &c. 24. 4. 17. —2. Pet. 1. 10. —2. Tim. 4. 7, 8.) To which Testimony of a good Conscience is added also the witness within them of the Holy Spirit, Rom. 8. 15. tho this witness (as also its other ordinary operations in us) most-what is not certainly known by us to be its witness or operation; for, if it were so, this would amount to special revelation. Catholicks therefore affirm not, a particular application of Christ's Merits to themselves, or a confidence of their own Salvation, in any justified, to be unlawful; but only an infallible certainty of these to be (except by revelation) unattainable: and whilst they say; that one, tho in the state of Justification, *de sua gratia formidare & timere potest*; yet they say not, that every one *tumere debet*. E.

E. See the Roman Writers quoted to this purpose by Dr. Field, Append. 3. l. p. 318. &c. And by Bishop Forbes de Jusitificat. 3. l. 1. c. p. 95. &c. Where, — *Communis Romanorum sententia* (saith he) *libenter admittit ex vive fidei sensu, seu charitatis & honorum operum experimento, certitudinem aliquam minoris & inferioris gradus oriri, que conjecturalis & probabilis nominari potest; & que, licet non omnem formidinem pellat, tamen tollit omnem anxietatem & hesitationem. Progredivintur alii quidam Romani ultius, & certitudinem aliquam aliam, minorem quidem certitudine fidei divine, Conjectuali tamen maiorem, quam certitudinem moralern appellandam censent, admittunt. Ita ut nullam habeant de sua justificacione formidinem deceptionis.*

The Pharisee very confident Luk. 18. 11. went home unjustified; the Publican very fearful, justified; and so the Leper believing Christ's Power, but doubting his good Pleasure, (*sic vis, potes*) yet was cleansed, Matt. 8. 2.

HEAD. XVII.

Concerning Sin Venial and Mortal.

*Concerning
Sin Venial
and Mortal.*

THE Catholick Doctrine is. 1. That all the Baptized are truely Regenerate. 2. That a Man falls not from this state of Regeneration, or from God's Grace, and favour by committing any Sin, how small soever; nor yet continues still in this State whilst committing any Sin how great soever. But 3ly, that there are some greater crimes, and offences against God, which are inconsistent with, and destructive of, the State of Grace; which do so break God's Commandments, as that (if not worthily repented of) they make us actually liable to eternal Damnation; after the committing of which (expelling us from the Grace and Priviledges of our Baptisme) we cannot be reconciled to God, nor restored to our former condition, without the help of the Keys of the Church (wherever this may be had.) Lastly, from which Sins by the Grace of God the Regenerate Person may totally abstain and totally reform his life, and in respect of them may, through his whole life, perfectly observe all God's Commandments. 4ly, That there are other lesser Sins, which are well consistent with the State of Regeneration. From committing of which (one or other of them) no man, tho Regenerate (abstracting from God's special Priviledge) can for any long time live free; nor in respect of these can be said perfectly to observe God's Commandments. *Bellar. de amiss. Gratiae* upon *Matt. 5.22.* *Si quis leviter irascitur* [which he calls a Venial Sin] *is jam recedit a perfecta observatione legis.* *Si quis autem manifestum convitium in proximum jactat,* *is demum non a perfecta observatione, sed simpliciter ab observatione legis recedit.* Which Sins, however they do, or do not, offend against God's Laws; or also, in their nature, do, or do not merit eternal punishments, yet all agree on this, that no Regenerate person at all by committing them, doth actually fall from God's favour, or his former righteousness; nor actually incur external punishments.

ments; and that the Regenerate, committing them, have always at least an habitual repentance of them.

Next, Concerning a Possibility to the Regenerate of fulfilling God's Laws, and freedome from, either Mortally or Venially offending him.

1. Catholicks do believe, that some good thought, word, Next, *Concerning a Possibility to the Regenerate of fulfilling God's Laws, and freedome from, either Mortally or Venially offending him.*

or work, may be performed by the Regenerate, and God's Commandments be observed therein, perfectly and without any contagion, or adherence of any Sin. But 2^{ly}, that none can certainly know of himself 1. Cor. 4. 4. when any work is so purely done. 3^{ly}, They also willingly concede; that the most, or very many, of the good works of the Regenerate are not done without some Sin, or defect in some smaller Circumstances thereof, by reason of concupiscence, negligence, &c; and that no Regenerate person (abstaining from the Divine special Priviledge) can for any long time keep all God's Commandments; as these Commandments are understood by any to involve the Prohibition of lesser (and those commonly called Venial) Sins. But 4^{ly}, they maintain, that many have kept and may keep, them all (thro the Grace given us by Christ, at our Regeneration) in the abstaining from greater, or those commonly called Mortal, Sins.

HEAD. XVIII.

Of Works commonly called of Supererogation.

*Counsels Evangelical, or
Works of
Supererogation.*

Concerning Evangelical Counsels, or Precepts of Perfection, and the Observance of them, called Works of Supererogation. 1. Catholicks disclaim any such Works, taken in such a sense, as Protestants explain, and impose on them. *viz.* That all things be performed, and fulfilled, that the Divine Law commandeth [*i.e.* in living free as well from all those called Venial, as from Mortal, Sins. *et c.*]

a. Bishop *White*, Answer to *Fisher*, p. 522. ‘To the Definition, and being, of Works of Supererogation Two things are required. First, That all be performed and fulfilled, which the Divine Law commandeth [he meaneth without any Sin at all incurred Venial or Mortal. See p. 523. but if, without Mortal Sin, and such as excludes from Grace, were only meant by this Bishop; so, he must grant; That all persons, whilst in the State of Grace, do thus fulfil God’s commands. He goes on.] But if just men have any Sin, they perform not all which the Divine Law requireth. Again, p. 527. ‘Supererogation implies these things. 1^o, A perfect and exact performance of all commanded Duties, without omission of any, &c. But (saith he) supposing the perfection of the Divine Law, and presupposing all men to be Sinners in part [*i.e.* as to Sins Venial] the former is impossible. So *Perkins*, *Demonstrat. Problem.* p. 117. Of the Fathers. *Volunt Supererogationem fieri, non quod officium aliquod praestari possit ultra legem moralēm integrām*, [as now the Papists hold] *sed quod sit, 1º Ultra negativam partem: ut non furari, &c. 2º Ultra actus externos. 3º Unum aliquod mandatum. 4º Ultra mandatum ceteris hominibus commune.* Bishop *Andrews*, *Resp. ad Apol.* 8. c. p. 196. *Quis nescit fieri a nobis multa libere? & que a Deo non sunt imperata, voveri, & reddi?*

reddi? In hoc tamen Supererogandi vis tota non est. Erogare prius oportet summan integrum, que imperata est nobis; Erogare quicquid debitum a nobis; Id, ubi jam factum, sum, & ultra illud, amplius quid, Supererogare. Peccatum in precepta quis; que debuit facere, non fecit; sed utrum uisio quid vel voluntarium praefixit: Hoc jam præter erogare est forte, non super. Where his Answerer (*Discovery of Dr. Andrews Absurdities*, p. 363.) long ago observed; ‘That he would have Works of Supererogation to be such good works only, as are done after the Precepts are fulfilled, or fully observed; and so quite changed the question, as it is stated by Catholicks.

And alij, beyond this; That something more be performed by us, than is any way due to God from us. *b.*

o. b. See the Reason given in the Fourteenth Article of the Church of England, why the Doctrine of Works of Supererogation is arrogant and impious: For (faith the Article) ‘by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do; [*i.e.* absolutely in respect of all the Divine Precepts] but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: Whereas Christ saith plainly: When ye have done all that are commanded you, say, *We are unprofitable Servants.* *Vossumus Tbel. de bonis Operibus*, Quest. 3. Thes. 1, 2. *Cum nemo, in hac infirmitate vite, praestet ea quae debet, impia est corum sententia, qui plus aiunt praestare, quam debet.* Refutat hoc etiam *Christus apud Lucam* 17, 9, 10. Bishop White’s Answer to *Fisher*, p. 526. out of *St. Bernard*. ‘By the obligation of Gratitude we owe to the Almighty *omne quod sumus & possumus* &c.

And 3rd, (As some Protestants add.) *y.*

y. Dr. *Hammond* (Of *Will-worship*, §. 32.) vindicating himself, in the holding Evangelical Counsels, yet from maintaining works of Supererogation. ‘The Romanists (faith he) mean by Supererogating; that, after having sinned, and so become debtors to God, they have paid that debt by satisfaction; *i.e.* done something else, which may satisfy God for their former sins. Which satisfaction, they say, they may perform so far, as not only to satisfy for their own sins;

Q. 2

‘but

Catholick THESES.

'but also to do more than so; help, towards the raising of a bank or treasure, for others also. Reiterated also in his Answer to *Cawdry*, p. 225.

That they be such works as are satisfactory, for our own, or also other mens, Sins, and Disobedience; and that are also laid up in the Church's Treasure for this purpose. Catholicks freely granting. 1st. That none can perfectly fulfil the Law, not only without the mixture of some imperfection, but also without the intervening of several venial or lesser sins frequently happening (See Head, *Justifica.* (ξ.) (γ.) But yet these sins or deficiencies not such, as cast us out of God's friendship, or the state of Grace; or as can hinder us from the greater reward in our observing of Counsels, any more, than they do from that lesser reward in our observing Precepts; From which Venial Sins also David, when yet he is said to have loved God *toto corde*, was not free. 2^{ly}, Granting also, That none can perform any work at all, that is not by many titles a due debt to the Divine Majesty (of which see before Head XVI. γ. 1.): yet not a debt exacted by him under pain of sin, or loss of heaven to those who do not pay it. 3^{ly}, Granting that these works are no way satisfactory for any ones Sin, or the eternal punishment thereof; nor yet of the temporal, but by application of Christ's Satisfaction; nor again these Works of Supererogation, and observance of the Counsels satisfactory in any other manner, than other works, that are observances of the Precepts, are also affirmed to be; nor is this [that there is any Treasure of the Church, partly at least made up of these] maintained to be any part of the Roman Faith: Concerning all which peruse the ensuing Head concerning *Satisfaction*.

But notwithstanding these Concessions, 1st, Catholicks (wherein Learned Protestants joyn with them) s.

s. *Mountague* in his *Appeal*, Licensed by Bishop *White*, p. 214. 'I know no Doctrine of our English Church against Evangelical Counsels. I do believe there are, and ever were, Evangelical Counsels; such as St. Paul mentioneth in his *Consilium autem do;* such, as our Saviour pointed at, and directed unto, in his, *Qui potest capere, capiat;* such, as a man may

'may do, or not do, without guilt of sin, or breach of Law; therefore are these no particular Precepts, obligatory to some, which have received from God such a particular gift; for then all that are so gifted would sin in omitting them; all not so gifted in doing them; and they would be Counsels to none at all. Nor would there be any place in them for St. Paul's doing well in the one, but better in the other.] Again, p. 216. (out of St. Nazianzen.) 'We have Laws that do bind of necessity; others that be left to our free choice to keep them, or not; so as, if we keep them, we shall be rewarded; if we keep them not, no fear of punishment. And, out of St. Chrysostome. 'A man may do more than is commanded [i. e. not as to fulfilling the whole Law, with freedome from all Venial Sin; but as to some particular Precept thereof, with freedome from transgressing it either by Moral Sin at all, or Venial Sin for some time.] Again, p. 215. and p. 218. 'The Doctrine of Antiquity, with universal consent, held Evangelical Counsels. —Name but one Writer in all Antiquity of a contrary mind to this; There are Evangelical Counsels. Bishop White, Answer to Fisher, p. 522. 'God Almighty doth not rigorously, (orras simply necessary to Salvation) [therefore not under pain of sinning, or such sinning at least; as excludes any from Salvation] exact of his 'Saints and Servants, that in every particular work in his 'service, they do the uttermost of their force, &c. Again, p. 527. He grants men may do more than God hath commanded by his Law as simply necessary to Salvation; to wit, 'They who give all their Goods to the Poor, &c. Again, p. 527. He allows Counsels; i. e. free-will offerings, or spontaneous actions, exceeding that which the ordinary bond of necessary duty obligeth men unto; and which are acceptable unto God in respect of their end. Dr. Hammond in his Treatise of Will Worshipp, §. 41. 'Every man is not bound, under pain of Sin, 'to be prudent, or pious, or merciful, in such a degree; I may 'give so much as will denominate me merciful; and pray so often as to denominate me pious; and yet be capable of growing in each of these Graces. And §. 47. That ordinary saying; 'That every one is bound to do that which is best; 'it is most discernably false (and that which a world of falsi-

'ties are built on) which to prove I shall need no further testimony, than that of the Apostle, 1. Cor. 7. 38. *He that giveth in Marriage doth well, and he that giveth not doth better.* 'If all were bound to do that which is best, that which were only good, were evil, for so is that, whatever it is, which comes short of what we are bound to do. *Ibid.* in his Answer to *Cawdry*, p. 192. 'The *Macedonians* (saith he) are an instance of doing more in this kind, than either all men, at all times, or they at this time were obliged to have done: And see before, p. 184. His instancing in St. Paul's taking no hire from the *Corinthians* for his preaching. *Ibid.* p. 195. 'He that observes the duty in any degree of the Latitude doth well, and he that goes yet farther, but not beyond the Latitude, doth better. [Why better, but because he doth more than the other; and more than the command requires under sin?] Again, p. 224. 'If every regular act of Obedience, which comes short of the highest degree of perfection, is a sin, than every act of Virtue in this life, is a sin; for the fullest perfection, which cannot be increased, is not to be found in any man in this life. And p. 225. he saith. 'That such persons may expect from our great *Saviour* more and greater acceptance [I shall add, reward also] than the same person could in reason expect for doing only what is commanded. And of two men, which have been equal in obedience, one exceeding the other, in acts of uncommanded perfection, the more perfect shall have the richest reward. In all which he saith plainly enough, that a man may do more than is commanded, as to some particular commands; praying; giving Alms; &c; and that without sinning in such act; or sinning either Mortally, or Venially, against such Precept, at another time; tho he denies this not sinning §. 31. in respect of all commands whatsoever; i. e. our never sinning against any of them; where if he mean venially, so saith the Roman Church with him.'

Mr. Thorndike in *Epilog.* 2. l. 32. c. p. 296. &c. justifies the Counsels of Contineney, of abandoning riches to which one hath just title: and St. Austin's Comment upon St. Paul's forbearing his dues for Preaching. *Potuit S. Paulus ex evangelio viderum sibi querere: quod dimulcet operari, amplius ergo valit.* *Ibid.*

Ibid. p. 298. Nay further justifies *Works* made in these Kinds, and a *Monastick Life* in the obseruance of them, See *L. 3. c. 31.* p. 368. 371. And of these Counsels he saith, p. 298, 'That the obseruance of them obligeth God in point of goodness, tho not in point of promise [he means promise annexed to a command.] And, 'That, tho the love of God, for which they do these things, is commanded, yet that they are not commanded to exercise that love in doing these things.

Maintain; that there are several such Counsels, or Precepts of perfection, in Scripture, which are not Precepts of necessary Obedience; and which, being obserued, are graciously accepted, and highlier rewarded; but not obserued, bring on us no guilt of sin, or liability to punishment; lastly, in doing which we do more than is commanded; v.i. in that particular matter, concerning which the Counsel is; and which are free-will-offerings and *indebits*, i. e. upon any Law exacting them so of us, as that, in the omission of them, we are held transgressors of it; i. e. Sinners. For tho God, whose are we and all ours, might justly require these works also under such penalties: yet such is his indulgence, that he calls not for all his dues from us on such terms, nor ties us in everything, under the pain of sinning, or incurring his displeasure, to do our best: for, then, he, that did not his best, could not possibly do well, nor any one better than well: coiteary to the Apostle, 1. Cor. 7. 38. and whoever can be any whit better, should be yet bad. Such works in *Confilio* are the highest degrees in the acts of Christian Virtues, or Duties; which Virtues consist not in an indivisible point, but have a certain Latitude, as there must be some lowest degree, as to time how often, or quantity how much, farther than which he, that descends, sinneth against the Precept, so are there certain higher degrees, as to time, place, or quantity, &c. which for encouraging our best endeavours, are by the Divine Wisdome allowed, commended, or (if you will) required, upon the title of perfection. Lastly, which are highly rewarded; but out of his mercy to our weakness, not strictly commanded upon the forfeiture of our being any longer good, or virtuous; nor the omission of them punished.
as, That hence clearly appears a degree of perfection in the obser-

obseruance of the Counsel always transcending that of obseruing the Precept, to which such Counsel relates: because these (such as are called Supererogatory) are always the more intenlive and heroicall acts of the same Virtues, or Duties.

ca. hoc enim aliquid in simili ratione videtur esse convenire
*Bellar. De Monach. 2. l. 7. c. 1. *Consilium includit preceptum, & aliquid supra preceptum addit.**

So there is a higher degree of perfection (*ceteris paribus*) i.e. as to good intentions, and the improvements made by the external acts on the inward habits, and our keeping still within the latitudo of the Virtue supposed a like in both; in distributing the fifth, than only the tenth part of our increase or goods, in alms to the poor; or giving dayly what another doth weekly; in praying seven times, than twice, a day; or with greater fervour than is that least degree thereof, which may be performed without sinning; Is an entire fasting, than temperate eating; and in a total abstinence from, than a moderate use of, delicate meats; or fasting four times, than only twice a week; in a virginal than a conjugal Chastity; preaching for nothing (whereby the more to advance the Gospel) than for wages; preaching once a day, (i.e. *ceteris paribus*) than once a week. And it were not reasonable, nor yet sense to say: That these Counsels, or higher, and more excellent, degrees of Christian Virtues, that are *in Consilio*, are the means only whereby we may more easily attain to the obseruance of that inferior practice of the same Virtue, that is *sub Precepto*, and under penalty of sinning, if not obeyed; or to say that our perfection lies in performing such precept, and not the Counsel; or that the Precept of the two is more highly rewardable; for that is to say; the less doing the more perfect, and the more rewardable, or rewarded. 34. Catholicks affirm; That there is no Precept at all all (i.e. taken in the former sense, as requiring obedience under penalty of sinning) but that there is some Counsel that transcends it; or, But that the superior degrees of the practice of it are *in Consilio*; and this, as maintained by Catholicks, so also is conceded by Learned Protestants. 35.

L. Bellarm.

Bellar. 2. l. 13. c. Ex toto corde, non significant omnes actus cordis, vel omnem intentionem possibilem; ita ut imperatur, ut nihil corde agamus, nisi Deum diligere, idque summae vehementia amoris, sed solum ut amemus Deum praecipuo amore, nihilque illi amore anteponamus, vel aequemus.

St. Thomas 2. 2. q. 184. art. 3. ad 2^o. Transgressionem precepti evadit, qui quocunque modo perfectionem divine delectionis attingit. Est autem infimus [perfectus] divine delectionis gradus ut nihil supra eum, aut contra eum, aut aequaliter ei, diligatur, a quo grada perfectionis qui deficit, nullo modo implet preceptum. Bishop White, p. 523. ‘We maintain not, ‘that this Precept obligeth man at all times to an actual employment of all his powers, and forces thereof on God, without conversion to other lawful Objects. Dr. Hammond of Will-worship, §. 49. ‘With all thy heart denoteth two things ‘only; 1st, Sincerity of this love of God, as opposed to partial divided love, or service; 2nd, The loving him above all other things, and not admitting any thing into competition with him; not loving any thing else in such a degree; and in neither of these respects excluding all other things from a subordinate place in our love: which being supposed, it will be easy to discern, that this sincere love of God above all is capable of degrees; and that it is very possible for two men to love God with all their hearts, i. e. sincerely and above all other things, and so both to obey that Precept; and yet one to love him in a more intense degree, than the other doth. Which may be observed among the Angels themselves, &c. And he in his Answer to Cawdry, p. 214. returns this answer to St. Austin’s Saying, Ep. 29. Quamdiu augeri potest [virtus aut charitas] profectio illud, quod minus est quam debet, ex virtu est; Urged by Cawdry, by Bishop White, and usually by other Protestants. ‘That the Father means not that every regular act of Obedience, which comes short of the highest degree of perfection is a sin; for so (saith he) every act of Virtue in this life will be a Sin, since any may be increased. And St. Augustine sufficiently clears himself from such a sense elsewhere (*De Spiritu & Lit.* cap. ult.) in saying, —Neque enim, si nondum esse potest tanta dilectio Dei quanta illi cognitioni plena, perfectaque debetur, jam culpe depuntandum

tandum est;] but that in some particulars, or others, still there is in some part, in this life, a failing of our duty; not only some defect in our Virtue, but also from it.]

St. Thomas 2. 2. q. 184. art. 3. speaks thus in answer to the Argument. *Ad observationem preceptorum omnes tenentur, cum sit de necessitate salutis; & igitur perfectio Christiane vitae non consistit in preceptis, quia omnes ad perfectionem non tenentur.* That, —*Non est transgressor precepti [perfectae dilectionis] qui non attingit ad medios perfectionis gradus, dummodo attingit ad infimum.* [Which lower degree every justified person must be possessed of before performing Counsels.] *Est autem (faith he) alia perfectio charitatis* [i.e. the higher degrees of it, that transcend the Precept] *ad quam quis per aliquid spirituale augmentum pervenit* [i.e. by practising and using the advantage of Counsels] *ut puta, cum homo etiam a rebus licitis abstineat, ut liberius animis Obsequis Varet.*

So the very highest Degree, that of perfect Dilection [*Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde & totis viribus*] doth not command, under pain of finning, and punishment, an entire employment of all our powers, thoughts and affections on God, wholly, perpetually; nor that we never love, desire or think on any thing besides him (Protestants assenting); but only such a sincerity of our love, *ut nihil supra eum, aquiliter ei diligatur;* Beyond which there may be yet a more intense dilection of him in *Consilio*, and most acceptable to God, to which we stand upon no such penalty obliged. ξ. (p. 125.) Neither can *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, who walked in all the Commandments of the Law blameless, and so observed this Precept amongst others, be imagined to have always exercised the same intensive act of love, or the one an act always exactly equal in degree to that of the other.

4th, In comparing Counsels and Precepts; or some Counsels with others, it is granted that the practice of some, may be the means or instruments of the acquiring of the other; or of any higher perfection therein; or also of the preservation of them acquired; in respect of which (as the means compared with the end) the Counsel may be esteemed inferior to the Precept. So by exercising some higher degrees of temperance, that are in *Consilio*, we arrive easier to the preservation

tion of virginal, or also a conjugal, and necessary Chastity, and such as is *sub Precepto*. And granted; That all Counsels whatsoever, are subordinate, and instrumental to the attaining of that one Counsel of perfect Dilection. In which, and not in any other of them (tho every one of them also containeth a greater perfection, than the particular Precept to which it relates; as hath been said *Thef. 2.*) ultimately consists the greatest perfection attainable in this life; and of which is that much noted proposition of St. Thomas 2. 2. q. 184. a. 3. to be understood; That *perfectio Christianæ vita*, *per se*, & *essentialiter*, *consistit in Preceptis* [viz. in these two *charitatis*, or *dilectionis Dei*, & *proximi*] *secundario autem & instrumentaliter in Consilio*; viz. those higher acts of other Virtues that do all tend to the perfecting of this love; but it is meant by him of this Precept of Love in respect of the superior degrees thereof, which are in *Consilio*; and not, of the inferior to which we are obliged under Sin; nor of the necessary degree of *Charity* which every one must already have to be in the state of Grace, or Justification; which state only produceth the acceptable performance of these Counsels we speak of, that tend all to a greater Dilection; and yet which state always presupposeth this Dilection already had in some degree. *y. (p. 119.)*

sly, In comparing the several States of men according to their practice of necessary Duties, or also of Counsels, as it seems clear that in respect of any Precept of necessary Obedience, and the Counsel relating to it, *ceteris paribus*, he must needs posses a higher degree of Christian perfection, that, besides the Precept, observes also the Counsel; that is, that performes the higher degrees of any Virtue, than he who only the less; so it is granted; that one in the observance of some particular Counsels, as Virginity, or Evangelical Poverty, &c. may be much inferior to another that observes them not, where some other disparities appear. As where the other observes some other Counsels of an higher perfection in which the former person is deficient; and especially if the later have attained to that, which is the end of all the other, a more intensively-perfect love of God; or also if he hath been constant in the performance of all the necessary duties with more purity and freedome from Venial Sins. *6ly*, Af-

6th, Affirmed also; That in one, who in respect of some duties aspires to Counsels, and doth more, at least as to the external act, than is commanded; yet if he be disobedient (so far as to sin mortally) in respect of any other duty, there ceaseth now all Supererogation, or any acceptable, or rewardable performance, of any such Counsels: because no work Meritorious or of Supererogation can be done, save by those, who are in the state of Grace, and possessed of the habit of Charity. (See Head XVI.) And therefore far are Catholicks from imagining any acquitting, or recompensing of disobedience in one thing by Supererogation in another; neither is the laudable, tho imperfect, performance of some Evangelical Counsels before Justification (whereby more easily to attain it, and the practice of necessary duties) reckoned by Catholicks any work of Supererogation, or to be any way preferable to, or so perfect as, the observance of those Precepts of necessary Obedience after our Justification, to which such Counsels facilitate the way. Much less yet is any thing to be accounted an act of greater perfection, or work of Supererogation, which is necessary to be done, in order to performing any Precept; for every Precept involves the injunction of all such means, without which it cannot be observed, upon the same penalty.

7th, This for the thing. As for the expression of Supererogations it is a word used, but not invented, by later times; but derived from Antiquity, who also took it up from the Scripture (Luk. 10. 35.) *Quodcumque Supererogaveris, ego cum rediero, reddam tibi.* Where St. Augustine, *De Sanctis Virgin.* cap. 30. *Nec enim sicut non Macchaberis, non occides, ita dici potest, non Nubes;* illa exiguntur, ista offeruntur; *si fiunt ista laudantur;* imperat vobis, in hoc autem si quid Amplius Supererogaveritis, in redeundo reddit vobis. And, *De Operc. Monach. c. 5.* *Amplius erogabat Apostolus Paulus, qui suis, ut ipse testatur, Stipendiis militabat.* Again, *Confess. l. i. c. 4.* *Supererogatur tibi ut debeas, & quis habet quicquam non tuum?*

2. 1. 2. 1. (129) 1101

HEAD. XIX.

Of Penances and Satisfactions.

THE Catholick Assertions concerning *Penances* and *Satis-* *Penances*
actions may be easily collected out of these *Theses* con- and *Satis-*
cerning *Justification* and *Merit*. *actions.*

1. By *Penances* Catholicks understand any Acts either produced by adjuvant Grace, before Justification; or by inhabitant Grace after it; that are some way painful, laborious, or afflictive to us, by depriving us of some Good, either *utile*, or *jucundum*. Whereby all sorts of good Works may be reckoned Penal, and Satisfactory; as they do cross and mortify our contrary, carnal, secular, and terrene appetites and inclinations. a.

a. *Eiusdem, 4. sent. 15. & 24. §. Pena non aliud est quam privatio boni vel utilis, vel delectabilis: (Nam privatio boni honesti ad culpam pertinet), igitur satisfactionem, que cum tali quadam privatione, seu subtractione, fieri debet, penalem esse oportet.* Lugo de Pénitent. Disp. 24. §. 3. *De facto, omnis nostra operato meritoria est simul satisfactoria; quia omnis de facto penalis est; & sicut omnis satisfactio est simul meritoria, quia debet procedere ex actione laudabili, & honesta, ut diximus; sic etiam e contra, omnis actio meritoria est Satisfactoria, quia offert secundum aliquam penalitatem. Ratio autem a priori est, quia nullum est opus honestum, quod non aduersetur alicui bono, vel delectabili, vel utili, &c. See §.*

Or would have crossed them, if these had not been by Grace formerly mortified; for, in such a case, a less pain in doing it, when it ariseth only from such a cause, diminisheth not, but increaseth the satisfactoriness and merit of the Work, as proceeding from a person more eminently sanctified, and one who hath formerly suffered the pains he hath now conquered. Such then, are both these acts of Christian Virtues, which are *sub Praecepto*, and cannot be omitted in due time and place

place without sinning and breach of God's commands : which, in what sense they are said to merit and obtain life eternal, (See before, Head XVI.) may be much more in the same sense to merit and obtain the remission of some temporal punishment ; (the divine acceptance being always supposed) : As, likewise, the same acts done more imperfectly before our Justification, are conditions or dispositions instrumental for obtaining remission of our Sins, as well as of the infusion of Grace, in our Justification. &c.

s. Lugo de Penit. 24. §. 3. Art. 1. Per opera praecepta posse hominem satisfacere &c; communis sententia & verissima affirmat. Et quidem, stante doctrina Concilii Tridentini, contraria sententia non videtur posse ultra ratione sustineri; Nam Concil. Tridentinum, Sess. 6. cap. 10. & 16. definit, iis operibus, quibus divina lex observatur, mereri hominem justum augmentum gratiae: Unde non appareat, cur non habeant ea opera vim purgandi debitum penae, sicut habens vim novum ius comparandi ad novum premium. And, see Bellarm. de Penit. 4. l. 13. c. §. Addit. quod. And Ibid. c. 8. He argues thus. Si opera iustorum [i. e. praecepta] eam vim habeant, ut vitam aeternam vere & proprie mereantur, nullo modo negari potest, quin etiam efficacia esse possint ad satisfaciendum pro reata pena temporalis; siquidem longe maius est gloria aeterna, quam pena temporalis remisso. In the same manner Lugo, Ibid. §. 1. Quia opera hominis justi habent aequalitatem & condignitatem [in what sense this see Head XVI.] in ratione meriti, in ordine ad beatitudinem aeternam; ergo possunt habere condignitatem ad redimendum paulatim debitum penae temporalis, quod est multo minus.

But such are more principally those higher acts of Christian Virtues that are in *Consilio*: (See Head XVIII.) which as they are still in a higher degree painful, and opposite to our secular contents than the other, and as in some sense in *debita*, (See Numb. 10.) freely undertaken, so are they more acceptable to God and satisfactory (in the manner which shall be explained hereafter) for any debt of punishment and suffering, that we still owe unto him, and that his vindictive justice, for our sins, is ready to inflict upon us. Thus the acts of any Christian Virtues may be reckoned amongst Works Satisfactory

HEAD. XIX.

322

in respect of cancelling punishment (as also satisfactions, as they also are good works, cannot be denied to be meritorious in respect of acquiring Glory, but more especially, &c.)

&c. See life eternal the promised reward of our temporal sufferings, 2. Cor. 7. 14. and 2. Tim. 1. 12. Rom. 8. 17. 13. and particularly of those Works wherein a satisfactory Virtue is said principally to consist; I mean Alms-deeds, Fasting, and Prayer. Matt. 25. 34, 35. —6. 6. 16, 18. [Where the open reward is the kingdom of heaven.] Bellarm. de Indulgenc. 1. l. 2. c. *In bonis actionibus dominum nostrorum duplex valet, sive premium assignari potest, meriti videlicet & Satisfactionis.* Again, Ibid. *In uno atque eodem opere bono, & elemosyna vel ieiunio, & meritum & Satisfactione repetitur. Nam elemosyna delat peccatum, quod est Satisfactionum esse, & tamen eadem elemosyna, quia est opus bonum, & Deo gratum, meritoria est vita eterna. Est Satisfactionum convenienter elemosyna, quia opus est laboriosum & penale; esse meritoriam concuerit eisdem, quia est opus bonum ex charitate factum. Eadem oratio finaliter impetratoria & meritoria [meritoria, quia orans, orando, bene operatur, & Deo placet], quid impedit, quo minus possit esse finalia Satisfactionia & Meritoria?*

those of Prayer, Fasting, and Alms-deeds: The first respecting the Soul; and involving all the mental Exercises, and spiritual Mortifications thereof, in the acts of Contrition (For Contrition is not denied, as it is penal, so also to be satisfactory) Confession, Deprecation, examinations of Conscience, intensive recollections of Spirit to celestial matters, &c. acceptable to God. The second respecting the Body; and including the several macerations, and subduings thereof, by suffering cold, thirst, hunger, hard fare, clothing, lodging, disciplines, watchings, solitude, silence, &c. The third respecting the goods of fortune; but also those of the Soul, and Body, in order to the shewing all manner of Works of mercy to, or any way benefiting, our Neighbour. Always provided that our penal Works in any of these three kinds be such, first as are for the matter of them, lawful, which all those are. (Learned Protestants consenting.) y. T. 1610. 11

See

y. i. See Dr. *Hammond*, in his Answer (maintaining good Free-will; or spontaneous Worships) against *Cawdy*, much in this matter. p. 154. ‘The Law and Will of God being the Rule, in agreement with, or opposition to, which, lawful and unlawful consists; it is as impossible, that any thing should be unlawful in respect of God’s Law, which is not forbidden by it, as that any should be lawful, that is forbidden. Again, p. 171. ‘The Pharisees doing some things which were not commanded, was no part of their Hypocrisy [I add, or fault] but on the contrary either their laying but not doing; or their preferring their own Traditions before commanded Duties. But still this is no prejudice to those real performances of more strictness than the Law exacts. Fasting twice in the Week, and the like; supposing they offend in no other respect, but that they are uncommanded performances. Again, p. 128. To *Cawdy*, urging concerning these very matters we are here speaking of, Penances, Pilgrimages, Laniations of the Body, &c. ‘That, since the Romanists do not hold them forth as Commands of God, that which makes them impious mistaken Mortifications, is their being voluntary Worships, He answers. ‘It is not their making them the Worship of God, that renders them culpable, but the unfitness or inordinateness of them to that end, to which they are designed. Such Laniations of our own Bodies [and might not he here have added St. Paul’s, 1. Cor. 9. 27?] being on that account deprived of all appearance of being acceptable to God [Acceptable to God, useful to that end or such end, the pricklings of an hair cloth, (Matt. 11. 21.) But not the lashes of a Discipline: Why so? Yet allows he there St. Paul’s Sufferings 2. Cor. 11. 27. which, why it may not include beating or scourging, as well as pining or prickling the Body, who can give a good reason?] Bishop *White*, Answer to *Fisher*, p. 302. ‘In a thing adiaphorous [i. e. no way commanded by the Scripture] it is sufficient to make the practice lawful, if it be not repugnant to the Scripture.

That are no way prohibited: 2dly, As are some way expedient and conducible to that good end to which they are designed, and, therefore also, acceptable to God; which many works

Penal Works ordinarily used in the Catholick Church need no such refuge; being either such as are commanded, and no where prohibited; and such as are known to be acceptable to his Divine Majesty, commanded us in the Scriptures, at least as to some inferior degree; or recommended to us there either in particular, or in general; and such as have been frequently practised by former Saints, and experienced powerful for correcting vicious habits, preventing temptations &c; and such as in Scripture have frequent promises made to them, of remission both of Sin to the not yet justified; and of God's temporal scourges for Sin; to those already received into his favour.

y. 2. Bellarm. de Pænitent. 4 l. 6. c. *Opera Satisfactoria in genere non sunt ceremoniae, sed res utilissimae, quarum in divinis literis extant exempla, promissiones, & præcepta [i. e. quod certum modum, the superior degrees being in Confitio, and therefore, when done, much more acceptable to God.] Again, Cap. 4. Pænitentiam Scriptura passim describunt per fletum, planctum, jejunium, saccum, &c. Itaque cum dicuntur aliqui Pænas sponte sua assumere, illud sponte sua non excludit mandatum Dei de pænitentia agenda, & operibus laboriosis assumendis, sed excludit certum genus, aut majorem mensuram operum laboriosorum, quam Scriptura, aut Ecclesia in particulari prescripsit.*

Lastly Catholicks affirm, that any such Acts may be reckoned penal and satisfactory, either when voluntarily undertaken and imposed by our selves; or when enjoined us by our spiritual Physician the Priest, (God's appointed Officer for reconciling Penitents, and prescribing the ways of making their peace with God); or also, when some of these, or other, Sufferings first imposed on us by God, yet are by our patience and cheerful acceptance of them, made, and so offered back unto him, as it were Sufferings of our own choice, in conformity to his holy Will. This said concerning the matter of Penances, next to proceed to their effect.

24, Catholicks then declare, That in the freeing us from Sin, and its bad effects, there are contained these particulars. 1st, The remitting of the fault or sin it self; as to the offence given to God by it, and our being resumed into his favour.

2dly, The remitting of the eternal punishment due thereto, which always accompanies the former; the retention of such punishment not consisting with a restored amity. 3dly, The remitting of the temporal punishment, or of some part of it. 4thly, The removing, out of our Soul, of the vicious habit, or inclination to Sin, left in it by the former frequented acts thereof. That three of these, the 1st, 2d, and 4th are removed in our Justification, without any thing in us meriting this, or satisfying for them. 4.

4. Concil. Trident. Sess. 6. 14. c. *In penitentia continentur &c.*
Satisfactiones per jejunia &c, non quidem pro pena eterna, que vel Sacramento, vel Sacramenti voto, una cum culpa remittitur &c. See Melanchthon Apol. Confess. Aug. Art. de Confess. *Fatentur Adversarii, quod Satisfactiones non proficiunt ad remissionem Culpa.* And Rivet (in Dialys. Discus's. Grot. Art. 4.) oppoling Grotius thought by him to speak somewhat Socinian-like concerning our Saviour's Satisfaction. *Hic etiam novam ipsis Pontificiis doctrinam aperit [Baptismo & precibus satisficeri Deo pro peccatis.] Applicari Satisfactionem Christi per Sacramentum & per fidem hactenus apud Christianos creditum est: Sacramentum & preces adhibitas esse Satisfactionem pro peccatis, nemo habens dixit vel, creditit.*

Only some pre-dispositions in us being required, without which the Application of Christ's Merits and Satisfactiones, and our Justification is not attained. That of these conditions or predispositions required in us one is Repentance: and in it a due Contrition, in a greater or lesser degree, according to the quality of our former offences, especially in any greater relapses from our first Justification. And again; That, for the producing such due contrition as likewise for the bringing the *purpose of Reformation* (another and chief part thereof) to good effect, there is ordinarily requisite the practice of the forementioned works of Penance, some or other, more or less according to the more stubborn, or flexible inclinations of the Soul to a penitent sorrow, and remorse, and softness, or hardness of the hearts of wretched sinners: less Penance being necessary, as the person better disposed. (z.) Yet that neither are these Penal Works so far made necessary
by

by Catholicks: as if all or most of them, were to precede every ones Justification; or any of them so absolutely necessary thereto; as that true Contrition may not possibly be without it: or such true Contrition, as is without it, not obtain a perfect Justification: ζ.

ζ. Bellarm. de Indulgent. 2. l. 17. c. *Satis nostrum posse hominem per internam conversionem ad Deum ita vehementer accendi in amorem Dei, & de peccatis suis dolere, cum proposito Confessionis, ut continuo recipiat remissionem omnium culparum & penarum.* [I add further; which intense and worthy Sorrow, or Contrition, did the Church know, she might absolve such Penitents (where no intervening of publick scandal) without imposing or reservation of any further Penance; or did the Penitent himself know, he also might omit all those other voluntary Penances, which he, without the Churches prescription, inflicts upon himself.] *Daille de Paenit. & Satisfactione,* 1. l. 2. c. 5. p. *Vel ipsi adversarii fatentur, insignem peccatoris contritiuncam omnem saepe paenam expungere.*

But only; That the Sinner, being uncertain of his possessing such a sufficient Contrition as is answerable to his offences, is exceedingly concerned not to neglect these means so much conduced thereto, which also are frequently in Scripture joined with Repentance, and have a like promise annexed of remission of Sin.

η. Conc. Trident. Sess. 6. c. 9. *Sicut nemopius de Dei misericordia, de Christi merito, deque Sacramentorum virtute, & efficacia, dubitare debet; sic quilibet, dum seipsum, suamque propriam infirmitatem, & indispositionem respicit, de Iusa gratia formidare & timere potest; cum nullus fore valeat, certitudine fidei, eus non potest subesse falsum, se gratiam Dei esse consecutum.* Thus the Council. Of which uncertainty Cardinal Lugo, *De Penit.* 2. *Disp.* §. 7. give these Reasons. *Quia nescimus, an actus doloris fuerit undiquaque bonus, absque admixtione alicujus circumstantie male tenentis se ex parte actus, qui reddit actu malum, saltet venialiter.* 2. *Quia saepe putamus nos diligere Deum super omnia, & fallimur; habemus enim occultum in corde affectum ad aliquid Deo repugnans.* *Sicut Saul, 1. King. 15.* And *Ibid.* In Answer to the Fathers. *Non negamus (faith he) expedire, ut peccator conetur*

summa intentione dolere, ut certior sit pénitentia &c. In quo sensu debent accipi Patres, qui summum dolorem exigunt. And to the Scriptures. Ibi Móvenur (faith he) ad id quod melius est; ne forte, dum minus volumus, non habeamus etiam quod sufficit. Conc. Trid. Sess. 14. 8. Cap. Debent Sacerdotes Domini, pro qualitate criminum, & pénitentium facultate, salutares & convenientes Satisfactiones injungere; ne si forte peccatis corriveant, & indulgentius cum pénitentibus agant, levissima quedam opera pro gravissimis delictis injungendo, alienorum peccatorum participes efficiantur [Which relates as well to the non-remission of the Sin, ne alienorum peccatorum participes, &c. if there be not yet true Contrition, as of the punishment.] Ibid. Sane & divina iustitiae ratio exigere videtur, ut aliter a Domino ingratiam recipiantur, qui ante Baptismum per ignorantiam deliquerint; aliter vero, qui semel a peccati & Daemonis servitute liberati, & accepto spiritu sancti dono scientes templum Dei violare & spiritum sanctorum contristare non formidaverint. [Which Reason holds as well for a sufficient Contrition in order to Remission of Sin; as sufficient Satisfaction, in order to Punishment:] Bellarm. de Pénit. 2. l. 11. c. Dolor de peccatis esse debet summus appreciativae; i. e. ut voluntas pluris estimet detestationem peccati, quam cuiuscunque boni consecutionem, aut alterius mali evitacionem. To which he adds afterwards. Ibid. Periculum est, ne homo se ipse fallat, & dum in se ad acrem & intensam contritionem excitare non satagit, revera ne appreciativae, quidem toto corde criminis detestetur. And elsewhere, De Pénit. 1. 2. c. 14. Quia nemo certo scire potest, se veram contritionem habuisse, Itaque ut quis de adepta indulgentia securior sit, debet omnia illa remedia adhibere, que Deus ad peccata purganda instituit. Again concerning a different Contrition of different Sins, Ibid. On St Cyprian's Saying, In Sermo. de Lapsis. Quam magna delinquimus, tam granditer desleamus, he Comments thus. Non significat dolorem absolute offensioni aequandum esse, quod fieri non potest; sed proportionem illam inter peccata & dolorem de peccatis, est debere, ut de maiore peccato magis, de minore minus doleamus. And on that of St. Ambrose, Lib. ad Virg. corruptam 8. c. Quanta putas, & qualis necessaria Pénitentia, que aut aequet crimina, aut certe excedat? Non ita accipendum est (faith he) quasi Pénitentia aquare, aut excedere debet peccatum, aut offensam Dei, sed ut dolor Pénitentiae aequet, aut excedat voluntatem quam peccando accepimus; quod alii verbis ita scripsit Hugo de S. Victore, De Sacram. 2. l. p. 14. 2. c. Si in correctione minor est afflictio quam

in culpa fuit delectatio, non est dignus penitentia tuae fructus. Estius,
 4 sent. 16. 4. §. 7. *Sicut peccata alia graviora sunt, ita magis
 de uno, quam de alio pro ratione gravitatis eorum dolere debet peccator,
 magis, inquam appreciative.* And, tho there he maintains, that, *ad
 remissionem culpe non necessario requiritur ex parte contritionis ad cer-
 tum aliquem gradum intensio, neque ad certum tempus extensio;* yet he
 speaks of *intentio, post Deum summe dilectum, & aliis rebus omnibus pra-
 latum,* which he requires even in the least Attrition profitable, so
 that a Contrition falling in any degree short of this is invalid; and
 this is no small matter.

For true Contrition containing in it both *cessationem a peccato,*
or vita novae propositum & imitacionem: and *veteris odium;*
 (Conc. Trid. Sess. 14. 4, cap.) Neither will hate be without tak-
 ing revenge, nor a Reformation effected without many painful
 acts in the crossing of our former secular, or carnal, Concupi-
 scences. And Mortifications of the Body do usually accom-
 pany a saving Contrition (that is, where is time, and ability
 to perform them) in the same manner as good Works
 do a saving Faith. And great reason have we to suspect, that
 these solitary internal Acts of Contrition accompanied with
 no external Humiliations (where strength or time fails not)
 are none of those vehement and intensive ones, as, alone, ope-
 rate the forenamed effect.

3dly, That the Sacerdotal Absolution, and Sacrement of
 Penance, appointed for the restoring of sinners relapsed after
 their first justification, yet hath not this real effect of restoring
 them when received, without any such due pre-dispositions
 in the persons absolved; and, particularly, without any such
 Repentance, Contrition, or Godly sorrow, as is required in
 the person proportionably to his sin, hath no effect, they say,
 till such Conditions be, first, performed. 6.

6. Cardinal Cajetan, Opuscul. Tract. 5. q. 5. *De horum numero uti-
 nam non maxima pars Christianorum penitentium sit, quos non sicut primos,
 puta virtute clavum de atritis regulariter fieri contritos, sed in sua at-
 tritione absolvit & communicare. Cujus signum est &c. De ipsis Confessione
 intelligo doctrinam Thomae [in 4 sent. 17. disp.] quod confessio infor-
 mis per defectum constringit valida, ita ut non sit iteranda; & erit
 cis*

eis fructuosa, quando ascendent ad eorū altū, ut habeant peccatum pro summo odibili & summo vitabili &c. See more in the Author. Card. Lugo, De Sacramentis, Disp. 9. §. 6. Sicut Baptismus, ablato obice, remittit priora peccata, sic Sacramentum Penitentiae remittit sua, ablato obice. Nulla certe ratio excogitari potest ad negandum hoc de Sacramento Penitentiae, si concedatur de Baptismo, & supponatur Sacramentum Penitentiae validum, & informe. Again,—Licit Sacramentum Penitentiae sit reiterabile, non est tamen obligatio reiterandi illud circa eadem peccata semel valide subjecta a clavibus. Unde, si non daret postea effectum, ablato obice, illa peccata non dimitterentur directe per claves Ecclesie, neque esset obligatio ea confundi ad hunc finem; quod ex vi presentis Institutionis videtur absurdum.

44. That therefore where no such worthy Repentance and due Contrition, or godly sorrow precedes such Absolution, these Penances (tho done after Absolution) have the self same operation and concurrence to produce such Contrition, and to procure our Justification, and the forementioned remission of Sin, and eternal Punishment ; and are as necessary for this effect as if done before ; and, till this effected, are for this very thing prescribed by the Church, or are to be voluntarily undertaken, by Sinners, as the principal end to which they tend, and for which they are imposed, or recommended to Christian Practice. Therefore the Baptist calls for these *digni fructus penitentiae* in order to escaping *ira ventura*; i. e. Hell fire, and the eternal punishment of Sin. See Matt. 3. 7, 8. comp. 10, 11; And as Protestants much urge, so Catholicks willingly grant, that the Fathers do make frequent mention of the necessity, and prevalency with God, of our Penances and Satisfactions, in relation to these effects. a.

x. Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. 8. cap. Debent Sacerdotes Domini &c. See (n.) *Ne, si forte peccatis conveaneat, & indulgentias cum penitentibus agant, levissima quedam opera pro gravissimis delictis injungendo, alienorum peccatorum participes efficiantur.* Now how can the Priest be so, if due Penance not required (I mean as necessary predispositions, and as concurring to effect a due Contrition) to Absolution from the Sin? *Eftius, 4 Sent. Disp. 15. §. 10. Quod Satisfactio, etiam subsequens absolutionem, aliquo modo respicere debet penam eternam, ex eo patet, quia & ipsa est pars Sacramenti penitentiae*

tie instituti ad solvenda vincula mortis aeternae; & absolutio datur, non tantum intuitu contritionis & confessionis, verum etiam Satisfactionis factæ, vel faciente. Cum igitur penitentem absolvat Sacerdos a pena eterna, consequens est, etiam Satisfactionem in suo genere atque ordine ad eam effectum valere, sicut Contritionem & Confessionem, licet non omnino equaliter. And lo Bellarm. de Pænit. 1. 1. 5. c. At que consumelia Christo esse posset, si dicamus meritum passionis ejus esse veram atque unicam peccatorum medicinam, eamque applicari per verbum abolutionis nis, qui per Contritionem & Confessionem, ac Satisfactionem propositam, ad eam medicinam recipiendam rite preparantur. [here is preparatio per Satisfactionem, ad applicandum meritum passionis, medicinam peccatorum.] Etius, Ibid. Satisfactione Christi per se suffici-entissima ad tollendam omnem pænam; sed divinitus sic ordinatum, ut ista nobis non applicetur, ne quidem ad solutionem pene aeternæ, nisi & ipsi per opera quedam penalia Christo compatiamus. Again, Sunt con-ditiones quedam penales ex parte nostra requisite ad hoc, ut passio & mors Christi tanquam plenissima Satisfactione nobis ad tollendum reatum pene aeternæ applicetur. Ibid. §. 14. Quarta utilitas Satisfactionis propria est placatio iræ divina super peccatis commissis, sive relaxatio penarum temporalium adhuc debitaram, vel etiam pene aeternæ, juxta sensum in Superioribus explicatum [i. e. per modum conditionis, &c. applying to this the Apostles words, 2. Cor. 7. Quæ secundum Deum tristitia est, pænitentiam in salutem stabilem operatur.] Bellarm. de Pænit. 4. 1. 12. c. Concurrunt & profundunt nostra opera penalia ad culpe remissionem, & mortis aeternæ liberationem, ut dispositiones, &c. Sicut actus fidei. See Ibid. c. 14. §. Ad hanc. 2. 1. 12. c. De bonis operibus, 3. 1. 3. c. *Vero enim ejusmodi elemosynæ* [now its the same of other Penal Works, Fasting, &c.] partim ut dispositiones ad Justifica-tionem, peccatum etiam quad culpam suo modo delent, dum gratiam impetrant justificationis; partim, post acceptam remissionem culpe, Sa-tisfactione pro pana temporali. And, Cap. 4. *Elemosyna dispositio est ad gratiam justificationis, si fiat ab eo, qui pænitentiam agere incipit, & ex Dei motione & auxilio speciali.* De hoc fractu loquitur Solomon, Pro. 16. 6. Luk. 11. 41. - 19. 8. comp. 9. Act. 10. 4.

Neither, since the regained amity of God, and remission of eternal torments is infinitely more valuable than the remission of the temporal, can it be imagined; but that God requires these our Humiliations, and Mortifications, as well for obtaining

taining of the first, as of the second. Or, that the ancient discipline in requiring the performance of these Penances from lapsed sinners, in order to procuring God's favour, pardon of their sin, and freedome from Hell, before the absolving them from such sins, and restoring them to the Churches Communion, herein mis-applied them. [Though that must be always remembred, which the Council of Trent hath declared, *Sess. 6. c. 14.* That, in respect of these, they are not *Satisfactions*, since they have no proportionable worth at all to them; nor yet, are the acts of a person by Grace inhabitant rendred acceptable to God; but are only conditions and pre-dispositions in us for obtaining the application of Christ's all-sufficient Satisfactions.]

3d. That therefore, though now in later times (wherein all the faithful, those also persisting in the state of Justification, yet do frequently, and beneficially, repair to Confession) not without good caules moving thereto, the performance of such Penances from greater sinners is not usually exacted, as anciently, before Sacerdotal Absolution, and admission to Communion; yet, still, where there is greater doubt of some defect in the Penitents Contrition, for the perfecting thereof Absolution, and approach to the Eucharist, is by prudent Confessors for some time suspended, and the performance of such Penances discreetly premised. *a.*

a. Layman, *s. l.* 6. Tract. 4. c. *Si Penitens, post duas aut tres Confessiones, eandem peccati speciem codem vel majori numero adferat, & nullus emendationis conatus ante confessio videatur; hoc casu differenda erit absolutio, nominato aliquo temporis spacio, intra quod Penitens conatum adhibeat ad criminis emendationem, postea absolutionem accepturus.* Bonacina de Penit. Disp. 5. §. 3. p. 2. Prop. 4. *Confessarius potest obligare penitentem ad penitentiam ante absolutionem adimplendam, quantum judicaverit expedire ad curationem, & medicinam penitentis.* See Suarez de Penit. Disp. 38. §. 7. n. 7. See the Rules of *Carlo Borromeo, Acta Eccl. Med. Part 4 in Instruct. Confess.* enjoining Confessors to defer Absolution to persons offending mortally in such sins, as are growne to much excels: to those who have not quitted the near occasions of their former sins; or who, they probably gather, will quickly return to them: [for the Contrition of such seems not sufficient]

cient] till some experience be had of their Reformation. And see *Xaverius his Instruction to Gaspar*, Rector of the Colledge at *Goa* (*Tursel. Vita Xaver. 6. l. 17. c.*) *Confessionem non continua sequetur Absolutionis; sed biduum, triduumve dabitur eorum peccatoribus certarum rerum meditacione preparandis, ut interim animorum maculas, lacrymias & voluntariis eluant penes. Si quid cui debent, restituant; simulatibus, si quas habent, depositis redeant cum inimicis in gratiam, a libidinis consuetudine, ceterisque, quibus impliciti sunt, flagitiis expediantur. Hoc omnia absolutionem rectius praecurrunt, quam sequuntur.* [Where the space of time mentioned, doubtless, ought to be prolonged, as a longer Mortification seems necessary.] Lastly, In the Pope's Briefs to those who are authorized to absolve in reserved Cases, they are enjoined not to absolve any for such great Sins, till some part at least of a rigorous Satisfaction first performed. See the large Collection of Authorities to this purpose in *Arnauld de la Freuen. Communion. Par. 2. c. 44, 45.*

64. That God, no Acceptour of Persons or Ages, doth in no times require lesser Penances or Humiliations from us for procuring his pardon of our sins, or averting either his eternal, or his temporal, punishment of them, than in others. So that, though such Penances happen not, for some good reasons, to be so severely now, as anciently, imposed on Penitents by their Ghostly Fathers according to the true demerit of their sins; or, being imposed equal to the sin in his judgment, yet really are not so; yet are they still in the same measure due, nevertheless, to be performed to God for such sin as well now as in any former times; and therefore the Council of *Trent*, endeavouring to correct some modern neglects, requires —*Ut Sacerdotes, quantum spiritus & prudensia suggesterit, pro qualitate criminis, & penitentium facultate, salutares & convenientes Satisfactiones injungant;* And that —*Non tantum ad novae vite custodiam & infirmitatis medicamentum, sed etiam ad praeteritorum peccatorum vindictam, & castigationem,* [an Office committed to them by our Lord, *Jo. 20. 23.*] *Ne si forte peccatis concurvant, & indulgentius cum penitentibus agant, levissima quedam opera pro gravissimis delictis injungendo alienorum peccatorum participes efficiantur.* μ.

p. Bellarm. de Indulgent. 2. l. 18. c. *Et veteres, & recentiores, Episcopi non aliis quam paenitentibus Indulgentias tribuunt, nec alias penas [Penances] quam in foro paenitentiaro debitas, relaxant. Quod autem ex paenitentia in foro paenitentiaro debitibus tunc relaxarentur penae injunctae, nunc autem tum injunctae, tum injungende, ratio est, quoniam tunc injungebantur severiores paenitentiae, qua sepe delictis aequales erant, nunc autem injunguntur mitiores, que delictis impares sunt; sed, siue pares siue impares injunguntur, omnino pares in hac vita vel in alia perseruenda sunt. [for our defect of performance of due Penance for our Sin] nisi misericorditer relaxentur.* Again, 8. Cap. *Hoc tempore non injungitur quidem paenitentia tam severa [i. e. pluribus annis] tamen vere debitores sunt, qui peccata gravia commiserunt paenitentia agenda multis, vel annis, vel diebus &c.* And, —*Ut plurimum, longe plus est quod expiandum restat per non-injunctas paenitentias, quam quod expiatur per injunctas.* And 7. Cap. §. Ex his —*Imo Sacerdotes cum Paenitentias imponunt, bortantur paenitentes, ut ipsi etiam sponte assumant alias, cum credibile sit impositas non esse aequales criminibus;* & Cyprianus dicat. —*Paenitentia criminis minor non sit, quod idem alii Patres docent.* Again, 2. l. 9. c. §. tertio. *Tunc maiores penas Deus exiget, quando Paenitentia Canonica injuncta est minor, quam par est, sed si injungatur aequalis [i. e. as explained below, Thej. 9. n. 4.] ut plauso injungi potest, & ea plene exorcatur, nihil in Purgatorio solendum superesse omnes Catholici docent. Estius, 4. Sent. dist. 15. §. 21. Si Sacerdos officio suo defuerit [in jungens, dans, opera levia pro delictis gravibus] vel etiam, iusta quaquam ratione addicetus, minorum quam pro exigentia delicti Satisfactionem injunxit; omnino videtur paenitens, qui cum defectum vel scit vel scire debet, tenere ad satisfactionem aliquam ultra assumendam, idque donec tota satisfactione perveniat ad quandam aequalitatem cum pena temporali pro peccatis debita; cuius ratio est, quia quatinus nondum fecit fructus dignos paenitentiae, nondum satisfecit divino precepto. Matt. 3. 8. Card. Tolet. Instruc. Sacerd. 3. l. 11. c. *Advericendum est, quod paenitentia imposta a Confessore quamvis, ut diximus, magis prelis quam voluntarie assumpta, non tam semper adhuc delet totam penam, sed partem aliquam, nisi tam grandis sit ut totam auferat. Sed humana fragilitas non patitur tales paenitentias: Ob id, merito indulgentis & omnibus bonis operibus vite iuvamus, & adhuc in purgatorio solvenda post obitum ferimus.* Lastly thus Lugo de Paenitent. Disp. 25. §. 2. *Non sufficere prudenter existimationem Ministri Probatur. (saith he): Quia ad causandos alios**

alios effectus Sacramentales non sufficit prudens existimatio ministri; v. g. in absolutione non sufficit, quod sacerdos prudenter judicet, penitentem esse dispositum, nec ad effectum Eucharistiae sufficit, quod prudenter aliquis existimet, se esse in gratia, & sic de aliis; ergo nec ad hunc effectum remissionis pene sufficit, quod sacerdos prudenter existimet, esse satisfactionem aqualem, si revera non sit: Dico autem aqualem non matematice (non enim requiritur talis) sed juxta regulam & dispositionem divinam, qua Christus instituit in hoc Sacramento tantam satisfactionem panisensis cum tali dispositione valere ad tollendum tantum reatum pene temporalis.

And, That therefore it is more beneficial to the Penitent, that these be, in case of great and mortal sins, in some larger proportion prescribed (and such Penitents have good cause both gratefully to accept, and to desire it of their Confessors); Both for that such Penances are as necessary now, as heretofore, to be paid in the same proportion, at least by our own supplying such a defect; and a less measure of them prescribed is more effectual to such purposes, than a greater voluntarily undertaken; both for the Sacramental efficacy, and the power of the Keys exercised in the one, that is not in the other; and also, for the merit of Obedience, when they may happen to be imposed by these our spiritual Superiors in a way less grateful to us.

¶ Layman, §. l. 6. Tract. 15. c. *Adulio plus valet modica penitentia a Sacerdote imposita, quam magna, quae sponte assumitur;* quia non hoc, scut illa, vim Sacramentalem habet [Estius adds; nor meritum obedientie; all Obedience being a kind of Mortification]: *Quamobrem optandum est penitenti, ut non levis ipsi penitentia imperetur.*

¶ Thus much of Penances and Satisfactions, as they relate also to Contrition and the Remission of Sin, and eternal torments due thereto, in our Justification. ¶, Catholicks affirm, That after Sin, and its eternal punishment thus remitted; and after the person restored into God's favour in his Justification, yet both after our first Justification by Baptisme, as to some temporal sufferings in this life, (tho not in the next); but chiefly, after a second by the Sacrament of

Penance, to those, who have relapsed after Baptism into greater sins, and who (to use the expression of the Council of Trent, *Sess. 6. cap. 14.*) *Gratia Dei, quam accepimus, ingrati spiritum Sanctum contristaverunt, & Templum Dei volare non sunt veriti,* there, many times, remains still reserved (and so not the Sin, always, as to all its punishment, remitted in our Justification, See *Conc. Trid. Sess. 14. Cap. 4.*) some temporal punishments, besides that common one of a corporal Death, to be undergone by them; God's justice not admitting so far the application to us, *gratis*, or for our former repentance, of the all meritorious satisfactions of our Lord, as that great sins especially should escape *impune* and unchastised with some temporal scourges at least: in this manner, to shew his hate to sin even when he hath taken into favour the sinner. Examples of which punishments of the sin, after God reconciled to the person, and so his offence in this sense removed, are found frequent in Scripture; See *Numb. 20. 12. - 27. 12, 13, 14. Numb. 14. 34. - 2. Sam. 12. 10. 13, 14. - 2. Sam. 24. 10. 13. - 2. King. 20. 6. 18. comp. 2. Chron. 32. 37. - 2. Chron. 20. 37. - 37. 22, 23. - 1. King. 13. 22. - 1. Cor. 3. 15. Exod. 32. 34. [Where the punishment threatened ver. 10. being remitted, yet are others (less than that) reserved, whersoever their new sins should provoke the Lord also to remember these.] *Josb. 22. 17. Psal. 89. 31. &c. Proph. 14. 31. - 1. Pet. 4. 18. Ecclesiasticus. 5. 4. Psal. 98. 8. - 1. Cor. 11. 31, 32.* Which temporal Sufferings of the already justified, Protestants also, though some of them had rather call them Chastisements and Corrections, than Punishments, acknowledge inflicted on them for former Sin; and amongst other ends, for this: to shew God's hate to Sin. ξ.*

ξ. Chemnitius Exam. Conc. Trid. Part. 2. De Satisfact. Fide, propter Christum, accipimus simul remissionem culpa & pena aeternae. Sed, quod ad penas temporales in hac vita attinet, post acceptam remissionem peccatorum, subiiciuntur [justificati] in hac vita vel communibus calamitatibus, vel peculiaribus penis propter certa, seu privata, quedam peccata. Ut Adam, David, populus Israel, Miriam. Testantur idem calamitates Baptizatorum post baptismum. Ostendunt etiam Scriptura exempla, Deum aliquando & post reconciliationem seu remissionem, qui-
busdam.

Vosdam singulares penas ob peccata in hac vita imponere; quanquam hoc non sit universale. Scriptura etiam dicit de reconciliatis; Corpus mortuum est propter peccatum, Roman. 8. & 2. Reg. 12. Quia fecisti hoc &c. Non quasi Deus illis nondum satis sit reconciliatus, seu aliquid offensa retinuerit, etiam post datam remissionem peccatorum; sed illis imponuntur ad castigationem sui, & ad exemplum aliorum. Ne, accepta reconciliatione, abliriscantur, quanta sit abominatione peccati & que magnitudo irae Dei adversus peccatum. Ut crescat in ipsis odium & detestatio peccati, timor Dei, fides sollicite curans, ut gratiam resineat. Ut his Exercitiis conseruetur & confirmetur penitentia, quo perpetua esse debet, fides, obedientia in Christo, spes, petitio, & expectatio auxilii, liberationis seu mitigationis. Demique Deus vult in illis sanguinem in publico spectaculo, conspicere Exempla, admonentia, & nos & alios de iudicio suo adversus peccata &c. Daille, De Penit. & Satisfact. I. l. 3. c. Neque absolute negaverat Calvinus priorem castigationem ad preteritum referri, qui sciret eas piis imponi ob admissa delicta. Libenter concedimus, ob admisso am Davide peccatum mortuum esse ejus filium. Mortem parvuli penam: [i.e. impositum in ultionem peccati] [tho ultio he calls it, when man- punisheth such Sin (See De Christ. Pacif. (e.) and so doth the Scripture (2. Cor. 7. 11.) why not when God] fuisse admisso a Davide peccati propriæ dictam negamus. Again, Sapientissimus Pater, ut graffatur a pesti occurreret, tempestiveque tanto malo mederetur, suum expec- cata, qualia a Davide admissa erant, odii [and why not as well suc- ultioris, which he denies, See pag. 5.] specimen edendum putavit, sub- lato, parentis ante oculos, filio. So he faith chap. 6. of the punishment of Moses's Sin. Ea insigne documentum fuit, tum nostræ misericordie, tum sanctitatis ac puritatis divinae; quae ne minimos quidem, vel carissimorum ministrorum natos sine animadversione transmittit.

But next, Concerning these temporal Punishments, Catho-
licks do not affirm; 1. That there always remains a debt of
them reserved after remission of the Sin obtained in Justi-
fication. But that, in this, one act of Contrition may possi-
bly be so intense and prevalent with his Divine Majesty, as
to remove at once, thro Satisfactions of Christ, whatever punish-
ment due thereto; 2. and that after our Regeneration in Bap-
tisme, no temporal Punishment, at least in the next world,
(of which see Council of Trent, Sess. 6. c. 14. Catec. Florent.
de Baptismo) where the person being now incapable of melio-
rating.

rating his condition, several former ends of such sufferings cease, remains payable for any sins preceding it. 2. Again of Punishments that remain, they do not affirm, the sole end of God's inflicting them to be the Satisfaction of his vindicative Justice upon Sin, but many other merciful purposes: As for the cure of the remaining stains, and bad impressions of such Sin, and of the vicious inclinations left in the offenders, or also for increasing the merit of the sufferer, by the exercise and improvement of many Christian Virtues in his patient and cheerful undergoing of them. Again, for the deterring them, or at least others, by the Example of these their punishments seen, or heard of, from committing the like offences. This last being one end of all temporal punishments whatever, whether in this life, or after it, so long as any live to take notice of them: for Death it-self is a perpetual Memorial to men of God's hate to Sin; and the circumstances of many mens death a warning to others not to provoke God's judgments in the like manner. 3. Again, Of these temporal punishments reserved, they affirm not, That all of them are certainly removable by any ordinary means used to avert, or prevent them; As the retaining of which may, some other way above mentioned, tend more to God's glory; as for Example: that of *David*, was not released; nor that of *Moses*; nor is the General one of a corporal Death, at some time or other, executed on all. &c.

¶ Bellarm. de Penit. 4. l. 3. c. *Pena temporales hujus vite interdum non possunt redimi, sed necessario perpetienda sunt: id, quod extra omnem controversiam esse videtur. Deus enim aliquando ita penam aliquam constituit, ut nullam pro ea redemptionem accipere velit. Talis imprimis pena mors est, quam nullus, quantumvis justus, nullo pio operé avertire potuit. Talis fuit illa pena Davidis (2. King. 12.) & Moysis. See Antidagn. Colonense de Satisfactione. Interim tamen & hoc prædicatum & doctrinam fuit [a patribus] neminem vel posse, vel debere Deo terminum aut modum retrussionis penae statuere; ac si oportaret Deum, ad completam Canonica[m] satisfactionem, illico a flagellis suis cessare: Christo vero reconciliatori nostro, cui Pater omne judicium dedit, prorsus relinquenda est pena remissa, a quo petere oportet ut obedientiam nostram velit per meritum suum patri celesti facere acceptam, & penam pre-meritam misericorditer avertire.*

And again, of those removable, they grant; That some may be so, only upon an intense act of Contrition, or upon Prayer and Deprecation without any further Penances, especially where opportunity doth not admit them; which Prayers, (and those considered not as Penal, but merely as petitioning), as they are held effectual, by impetration of the application of Christ's Merits, which God, for averting temporal punishments from others, living or dead; so, much more, may they be, from our selves. .

. Lugo de Pænitent. Disp. 24. §. 1. *Facilius potest aliquis impetrare sibi, quam alteri. Neque illa peccata manent tunc imputata, sed satisfacte plene diuine justitiae, applicando Satisfactiones Christi propria, quam nos debebamus solvere; que applicatio obtineri potest aliquando per orationes. Sic ut manent imputata peccata, quando pena pro iis debita remittitur per Indulgentias, aut Sacraenta vel Sacrificia; quia tunc etiam Satisfactiones Christi applicantur, quibus solvitur plenissime totum debitum.*

But meanwhile the faithful, not knowing the just measure, value or effect, of his own Contrition, or Prayers, where time serves, cannot upon this prudently omit any other means, which God hath left as helpful for attaining the same effect; and those things are at all times to be held necessary and useful, which at no time he knows to be superfluous.

8th, Catholicks affirm: That, as the aforesaid Penances, and Satisfactiones, when done only by Grace assistant, are prevalent with God for obtaining the Remission of Sin, and its eternal punishment in our Justification; so, after it, that these, when done by Grace inhabitant, may much more prevail with God, for obtaining the remission of some temporal punishment, Chastisement, or Correction, still reserved by God as the scourge of the Sin, though after his having re-admitted into favour the Sinner. A thing conceded also by Protestants. .

. Chemnitius, Exam. Conc. Trid. 2. Part de Satisfactionibus. *Illas etiam temporales penas, Scriptura tradit, reconciliatis, propter filium mediatorem, sape vel mitigari, vel prouersus tolli, quando vera humilitate peccata agnoscunt, fide Deum invocant, veterem dominum mortificans*

tificant, & serio novam vitam meditantur, hoc est, non in debitibus humana-
rum traditionum operibus, sed tota paenitentia, que habet mandatum
Dei, penitentia illa propter Christum mitigantur. [quoting 2. Paralip. 6.26.
Joel, 2. 13. -1. Cor. 11.] Observandum vero est (saith he) penas tem-
porarias mitigari ista paenitentia, non quod opera ejus sint vel compensa-
tiones, vel merita remissionis peccatorum, sed quia castigationibus illis Deus
in reconciliatis nihil aliud querit, quam ut conservetur magis accenda-
tur, crescat & augentur vera humilitas, agnitus, odium & detestatio pec-
cati; exercitum fidei, mortificatio veteris hominis, patientia, spes &c.
Daille, De Paenitentia & Satisfactione. 7. l. 6. c. answering to the Fathers.
Significant (saith he) temporalibus illis penitentia, quocunque tandem sint,
eos, quos peccati vere penituit, [i.e. penitentia ejusque fructibus, la-
ebrymis, jejuniis, orationibus, elemosynis, as he expreleth it before]
non aliter eximi ac liberari, quam si nullas unquam essent proueriti.
Hunc vero penitentiae certum & immutabilem eventum esse (quod ex
Patrum dictis sequitur) ultra, ac libentes, fatemur; eventum istum
ex jure & justitia, sive ex penitentia ipsius dignitate esse, non autem ex
merita Dei optimi misericordia, ac veritate, constantissime quidem negamus.
Bishop White against Fisher, Q. 21. P. 540 grants, 'That, after great
& enormous offences committed by his people, God doth chastise
them with the rod of Correction, Ps. 89. 33. -1. Cor. 11. 31, 32.
Which Correction is a pain of Castigation, but not a punishment of
Malediction. Grants also, 'That this affliction or pain of chastise-
ment inflicted upon penitent Sinners, may by Prayer of Faith, exer-
cise of Virtue, Humiliation and Mortification, be either removed,
& or else mitigated. But denies, that such persons can by Prayer, Mor-
tification or any good Works, merit release of any temporal Maledic.
And contends, 'That the Fathers under the word, Satisfaction, under-
stand not the word Satisfaction strictly and in rigor, for satisfaction
'of condignity, as Romists do, but improperly and largely, to wit, For
'satisfaction of deprecation, congruity or impetration. Calvin, De
Christianis Pacificat. 5. c. Qui penas dirimas auertere cupit, non est,
quod student satisfactione aliqua, quod deliquerit expungens; [because
Christ's Satisfactions have, and only can, do this] Sed, se quibuscum-
que potest modis cum ad humilitatem, tum ad veram resipiscientiam eru-
dens, suipius peccati ulti sit homo; ne Deum experiatur ultorem [by
not having Christ's Satisfactions applied to, or accepted for him]
Qui Deum sibi vult parere, ipse sibi nec parat nec indulget &c. Sed
hoc totum nihil est ad mutuam compensationem: Nam qui in hunc modum
de

de se penas sumunt, quo præveniant Dei iudicium; constitutus sibi nibil-
animus in Christi Sacrificio non modo culpe expiationem, sed penarum
etiam, quæcunque meriti sunt, veniam. Spalat. 5. l. 8. c. 4. 9. Deus,
quoniam peccatum nullum relinquit absolute unpanitum (quia misericors
quidem est, sed etiam justus) cum dilectis suis ius agit; ut, si ipsi in se-
peccata propria puniantur, ille nolit ea ordinarie punire, & contentus est
ex sua misericordia, ut loco flagellorum, quibus ipse solet peccata hominum
in hac vita punire, penæ a peccatore voluntarie assumptæ succedantur: eas
Patres ponunt in interna paucissimum contritione, qua Peccator scipsum,
adactus divina Gratia, mactat propter peccatum. In reliquis sufficit
Christi Satisfactionio; sed que nemini applicetur, qui penitens non sit, &
consequenter, qui de scipso prius aliquas penas saltem interni doloris non
sumit. Satisfacit ergo Deo, qui hoc facit, quia facit id, quod Deus ab
eo requirit. & quo facto ipse plenam donat remissionem, non propter banc
minimam, nulliusque precii aut meriti satisfactionem; sed propter plenam
satisfactionem Christi. Dr. Fern (Answer to Spencer, p. 146.) ‘We
cannot allow the Purposes (or at least Practices) of the Romish
Church, in commanding those Penalties, as meritorious and satisfactory
to God’s Justice; that I may say nothing of the no small gain, that is
made thereby. But we allow and commend the doing of the things,
these self-afflictives, 1st, In order to the obtaining of Remission of
Sin, and Punishment: So the sackcloth, ashes, lying on the ground,
as in the Ninevites, Jonah 3. c. 2. After forgiveness, they are
profitable, when done, either in respect to Sin past, by way of
wholesome Discipline, to make us more wary of such Sins, &c. Or,
when done in order to averting some temporal Judgment &c. And
these afflictives, or exercises of self-denial, may be either voluntary,
undertaken of our selves; or, by advice of the Priest, that hath the
Ministry of Reconciliation, and the power of loosing committed
unto him. And the less that God doth inflict on us &c, the more
we are concerned to impose on our selves such Acts, &c. [In all
those you may observe the Catholick Doctrine so misunderstood, or
at least misrepresented, by them, as if it maintained these Penal Works
to be Satisfaction in rigid Justice, equalizing, and compensating such
punishments; and that, without any relating to, application of, or
*dependance on, Christ’s Satisfaction. *Fili Æ hominum, duro corde, ut**

quid queritis mendacium?]

Are prevalent with God they say; though not, always, and for all such punishments (at least in such a degree, as these Penances are usually performed) but many times, or for the most, either for averting all, or at least part thereof; But 2dly, When they are not this way effective, for the Reasons given before; yet do not such persons lose their reward, *vis.* The recompence of a future greater portion of Glory according to the measure of such Penances: all Works that are in this way *satisfactory*, being also (as commonly the higher and uncommanded Acts of Christian Virtues, and of Grace infused) in the other way meritorious.

9ly, Whether these Penances obtain such Remission of Temporal Punishment by way of *Impetration* only, or of *Satisfaction*, or (which is the same) by way of *meriting* such Remission; and, if they Satisfactory, in what manner they be so, much-what the same things recur in the stating of these, as before of *Merit*. 1. Catholicks disclaim *Satisfaction* in such a rigid fence, as Protestants impose on it. *viz.* That it be a suffering, or satisfaction, that equals, in rigor of justice, the punishment reserved. 2. That it be an act of our own ability, not merely of his Grace, to whom we offer it in Satisfaction. 3. That it be not a work due to him already upon many other accounts (though we were to have made him no such Satisfaction therewith) from our being his Creatures; and again his redeemed servants, and slaves; and, so all that we are, or can do, wholly his, See 7. 1. Though it is true, that out of God's great Indulgence to us in the new Covenant, all his dues are not called for by him, in any strict command, or precept of his, made under the penalty of our Sinning, and being punishable, for an omission thereof; and so trne, that, some Works of ours, that are very acceptable to him (and, amongst these, the chief of them which are accounted Satisfactory) yet are, in the former fence, *indebted*; and we are enabled by his Grace to give him a great deal more, than, upon any prescribed Penalty, he asketh us. Catholicks therefore *1st* affirm of Satisfactory Works as before of Meritorious; That whatever satisfactory worth there may be in them, it is to be ascribed not to our strength, but God's Grace, purchased by our Lord's Satisfactions, and inhabitant in us, which is the Fountain of them. 7. *Lugo,*

v. Lago, Disp. 24. §. 1. *Licet opera nostra habeant de se illam va-
lorem & dignitatem; non tamen expiarent formaliter, & infarant debi-
tum pena temporalis, si non accedet et acceptatio Dei liberæ acceptantia;*
*atque ideo hæc acceptatio de facto sicut propriæ Christi. And afterward,
Qui patuit (sicut he) non acceptare; sicut de facto pro aliquo debito pena
temporalis non acceptat.*

vi. *Whatever value they have, they cannot challenge,*
from God, the remission, or quittance of any such Punishment,
but according to his own gracious Acceptation of them through
Christ's Merits to this purpose; they being all due to him upon
another account, as hath been said; and, if they were not so,
he not being obliged, without a promise passed; no any equal
exchange.

v. S. Thom. Suppl. Q. 13. A. 1. *Non potest homo Deo satisfacere,
si [satis] aequalitatem quantitatis importet; contingit autem, si impor-
tet aequalitatem proportionis; & hoc, sicut sufficit ad rationem iustitie,
ita sufficit ad rationem satisfactionis. Quia amicitia non exigit aequiva-
lens, sed quod possibile est. Again, Quamvis totum suum posse homo
Deo debet, non tamen ab eo exigitur de necessitate salutis, ut totum quod
possit faciat. Bellarm. De Penit. 4. l. 7. c. Nos de satisfactione illa
verbis facimus, que (ut nostri loquuntur) ex condigno quidem peccatum tem-
poralem expiet, non tamen ex rigore iustitie. Satisfactione enim ex rigore
iustitie duo requirit, ut satisfiat ex propriis; & ad aequalitatem, nulla
videlicet per curiente aut intercedente gratia ejus, cui debetur satisfactio.
Nos videntem ne quid aliquid habemus quod Dei non sit, neque possumus ullo
genere bonoris adquare iniuriam, quam Deo fecimus. Nihilominus
tamen accidente gratia Dei, eaque multipliciter, vere possumus, aliquo modo
ex propriis, & ad aequalitatem, ac per hoc juste, & ex condigno satis-
facere. Atque modo, i. e. dum opera nostra, ut a Spiritu Christi in
nobis habitante procedant, quandam habent assimilitatem.] And, —Dum
Deus, qui omnia nostra sibi jure vendicare posset, non omnia que facere
possumus imperat. Lago, De Penit. Disp. 24. §. 1. Comparing Merit
and Satisfaction. *Sicut mereri* [in the sense that Catholicks use it]
*non est emere pro aequali pretio, aequalitate rei; sed est seminar apud equi-
tatem, & exactitudinem Principis; quare aequalitas meriti, non est sicut
precii; sed sicut seminiis, in corde Principis secundissima. Sic etiam*
*confitimus.**

facere non est satis pati; sed imitatur meritum, eo quod debitor tendat ad placandum Principem & alliciendam ejus mansuetudinem ac clementiam, ut acceptet voluntariam punitionem anticipatam, & placetur, ne exigit debitam penam. Unde multo minor penalitas sufficiet ad expiandum debitum majoris penalitatis. And Disp. 25. §. 2. Dico Satisfactionem equalem non Mathematicae (non enim requiritur talis) sed iuxta regulam & dispositionem divinam, qua Christus instituit in hoc Sacramento tantam Satisfactionem Penitentis, cum tali dispositione [interna] valere ad tollendum tantum reatum pene temporalis. See the stating of Merit in *Merits.* n.]

3^{ly}, Yet that these Penances, being the fruits of the Spirit in the Regenerate, and adopted Sons of God, have a supernatural dignity in them, most acceptable to him, See *Merit, Thes.* 3, 4 especially those, done freely by them beyond the obligation of his Precepts: and so; the same which hath been said, of the worth of their other good works, *Set before,* in order to their meriting, in some sense, eternal life, may, much more, be said of these, in order to their meriting, in the same sense, the remission of, or (which is the same) satisfying God for, some temporal Punishment. (That is;) In such a sense, as these good Works may have a worth acceptable to God, for obtaining from him that which is more, they may, for procuring, or giving satisfaction to him, for that which is less. 8. A like worth to which no Penal Works have, that precede our Justification as to any remission of the eternal punishment; a pardon always received, before the production of these later Penances that follow Justification; which therefore are affirmed Satisfactions for the temporal Punishment, not for the eternal. *Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. c. 14.*

4^{ly}, But, in this satisfaction, or remission of the one, (Sufferings that are to be inflicted) for the other, (Penalties voluntarily undergone) there is affirmed no equality, in strict justice, of the later to the former; of the sufferings performed by us, to those remitted by God: but these, far greater, affirmed to be averted by the other, far lesser; therefore they are called *Satisfactions* in reference to God's acceptance; not *Satisfactiones* (a just recompence of) in comparison to such punishments. v. But, since God's Justice suffers no Sin to pass unpunished,

punished, nor Punishment to pass unsatisfied-for, to the uttermost, by some person or other, therefore, for whatever they are deficient herein, it is affirmed to be abundantly supplied in, and by, the Satisfactions of our Lord; applied for the remitting of these temporal Punishments less or more, according to the various measure of those self-revenges, and fruits of Penance, which Christians bring forth and offer to God for their release. As also, the same Satisfactions of our Lord are affirmed to be applied to the faithful, for remission of these Punishments, by the Sacraments of the Church, by oblation of the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood for them, by the Churches Indulgences; Lastly, by their own Prayers, though without any other Penal Works, as God pleaseth: God's Justice finding these plenary Satisfactions in his Son, for any Punishment, eternal, or temporal, the pardon of which his Mercy is pleased to indulge us without our own. &c.

¶ Concil. Trid. §. 14. c. 1. *Sacramento Penitentiae* [one part of which are Satisfactions, *lapsis post Baptismum*] *beneficium mortis Christi applicatur*. Ibid. c. 13. *Si quis dixerit pro peccatis quodam panam temporalem minime Deo, per Christi merita, satisficeri penit, ab eo inflatis &c. Anathema sit*. Again, Can. 14. *Si quis dixerit Satisfactiones, quibus Penitentes, per Christum Jesum, peccata redimunt, non esse cultus Dei &c.* Again, Cap. 8. *Dum satisfaciendo, patimur pro peccatis, Christo Jesu, qui pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, ex quo omnis nostra sufficientia est, conformes efficimur. Omnis Gloratio nostra in Christo est, in quo meremur, in quo satisfacimus, facientes fructus dignos penitentia, qui ex illo vim habent, ab illo offeruntur Patri, & per illum [per illius merita] acceptantur a Patre &c.* Ubi vides (faith Cardinal Lugo, De Penit. Disp. 24. §. 1.) *intervenire merita Christi nou solum, ut fiant nostrae satisfactiones; sed etiam, ut acceptentur a Deo.* Again, Cap. 9. *Corporalibus flagellis a Deo infictis & a nobis patienter toleratis apud Deum Patrem, per Christum Jesum, satisfacere valamus.* [Upon which thus Lugo, Ibid. *Congruum est, quod hoc etiam beneficium non aliter concederetur nisi propter Christum, propter quem Deus remittit & indulget omnia, que quolibet modo nobis remittuntur, & indulgentur.* For, since God's Justice must be fully satisfied, by some person or other, for all Sin, and all its due punishments (Else why suffered Christ?) and the Satisfactions of our Penal Works are affirmed,

affirmed, not in rigid justice to equal the temporal punishment remitted; here also our Satisfaction are compleated by Christ's in the same manner, as our Merits. And what Cardinal Lugo saith, in Defence of that Thesis; *Liberari nos posse a debito penae temporalis per impenitentem, vel merito congruo*, may as well be laid of our freedome from it by our imperfect, and diminutive, Satisfaction. *Nostra peccata non manere sunc impunita* [as to what they fully deserve:] *Sed satisficeri plene divine justitie, applicando satisfactiones Christi propensa, quam nos debebamus solvere*; que applicatio obtineri potest usq[ue]nquo per orationes. *Sicut, nec manent impunita peccata, quando pena pro iis debita remittitur, per Indulgencias aut Sacra menta, vel Sacrificia: quia tunc etiam Satisfactiones Christi applicantur, quibus solvitur plenissime totum debitum.* Suarez, De Penit. Disp. 36. §. 1. *Nostra Satisfactione Christi Satisfactioni innititur, non solum quia per illum habemus virtutem satisfaciendi, sed etiam quia nostra Satisfactione propter ipsum acceptatur, & rationem justitie participet, in eius Satisfactione fundatur.* Antididagma Coloniense de Sac. Penitent. De hac satisfactione Canonica & Disciplinari semper docuerunt Patres, quod virtute sanguinis, & merito pallionis Christi, auferat, aut saltem minuit, penam temporalem peccatis nostris debitam Christo Reconciliator nostro, cui Parer uniuersum iudicium dedit, prorsus relinquenda est penie remissio; a quo petere oportet, ut obedientiam nostram [in our Penal Works] velut per meritum suum, patri celesti favere acceptam, & pacem promitterit misericorditer avertere. Dr. Holden in Resolut. Fidei, where he endeavors to separate matters of Faith from disputable Question, 2. l. 5. c. *Nulla prouersus est satisfactione ab homine quovis etiam justissimo peracta, que Deo sit grata, vel que sit aliquius omnino valoris, nisi per meritum Domini nostri Iesu Christi.* *Pariter quidem satisfaciendo pro peccatis, sed unquam fatus patimur.* Christus est, qui solum vere, & plene pro peccatis nostris satisfecit ex quo est omnis nostra sufficiencia. *Nostra uamque Satisfactione, qualis, qualis est & quo modo nostra est potius est quedam meritorum Christi nobis applicata, quam propria aliqua Satisfactione.* And see Mr. Hooker in his Discourse of Justification, p. 62. quoting Pangurula, Lett. 11. And the Rhemish Annotations to this purpose. "We put (saith the one) all Satisfaction in the Blood of Jesus Christ. But we hold, 'that the means which Christ hath appointed for us, in this case, to apply it, are our Penal Works. And thus the other on 1 Job. 1:7. 'The Blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all Sin. Whether sins here remitted by Prayers, by Fasting, by Alms, by Faith, by Charity, by

'Sacri-

H E A D. XIX.

155

‘Sacrifice, by Sacraments, and by the Priests (for the Holy Scriptures do plainly attribute Remission to every of these) yet none of all these do otherwise remit, but in the force by the merit and virtue of Christ’s Blood; these being only the means and instruments by which Christ will have his Holy Blood to work effectually in us. Which Point let the Protestants mark, and cease to beguile their Followers, persuading them, that the Catholicks derogate from Christ’s Blood, or seek Remission [either of Sin or its Punishments] otherwise than by it, because they use humbly the means appointed by Christ to apply the Benefit of his Holy Blood unto them. [And from Generation to Generation let this be repeated unto them, *In Testimonium, Illis.*]

10. Lastly they affirm such Penances, beside the former ends, very effectual also for the full cure and eradication of the stains of Sin left in the Soul, and for the subduing of vicious habits, and preventing the like sinful Acts for the future by removing the occasions of them; practising acts of Virtue contrary to them; inflicting Pains equalling the Pleasures of them, &c.

H E A D. XX.

*Concerning one Person, his Meriting, or
Satisfying for another.*

Concerning one Person’s Meriting, or Satisfying, for another, as to remission of Sin or Punishment. 1st, It is one Person’s granted by all, that one Man’s Prayers may impetrare, (i. e. Meriting, or from God’s Mercy by application of Christ’s Merits to this Satisfying, purpose) Grace; Repentance; Contrition; and so Remission for another, of Sin, of any (eternal or temporal) Punishment; Salvation;

a. Daillé,

Daille, De Penis & Satisfactione. l. 17. c. Cæstros [i.e. Martyres] vult [Origenes] peccata dimittere, non ultra pro peccatis satisfactione, sed preciosus, quas Domino pro hominibus morientes oblatuerunt; quibus scilicet effatum est, ut clementissimus Dominus multos ad se conversos peccatis liberaret. Num vero aliud est prece aliquod beneficium hominibus a Deo impetrare; (quod Sanctis & vere fidelibus convenire fatemur?) aliud ultrici Dei iustitie pro aliorum peccatis ex condigno satisfacere; quod sanctis adversarii tribunt, nos negamus. Spalatenlis, De Rep. Eccles. l. 8. c. §. 18. Dispositio nunc non est, neque esse potest alterius dispositio; meritaria fortasse improprie potest esse, & impetratoria, ut iusti suis orationibus, & humilationibus impetrant peccatori penitentiam & dispositionem, ut tamen ipsorum satisfactiones & humiliaciones suppleant pro alterius satisfactionibus & humilationibus; & sic ille alter dispositus ad remissionem dicatur per alienam dispositionem, & humiliatus per alienam humilationem, est impossibile.

23, That one Man's Penances, Humiliations, Mortifications, may have the same (or a stronger) effect, for impec-
tation of these things for others, as his Prayers have, *Psal.*
34. (or 35.) 12, 13, 14 — 2. *Sam.* 12, 16. 34, It cannot ra-
tionally be denied; but that, whatever worth, or value, such
Penal Works have as to removing any ones own temporal
Punishment, the same they have as to removing another's,
If his Divine Majesty please to accept of them to this purpost;
and, that one man's Satisfaction are applicable also to ano-
ther, is clear in Christ's, so applied. *f.*

8. Lugo, De Penitent. Disp. 26. §. 1. *Hic modus solvendi patiendo pro aliis non repugnat ex se; cum Christus Dominus utroque modo nobis profuerit, nempe merendo & rursus satisfaciendo etiam pro nobis, ut constat ex satisfactione ipsius, que pro debito panæ nobis applicatur per Sacramentum aliqua & Indulgentias; poteris ergo satisfactio unius justi alteri applicari.*

But whether such Works are prevalent with God for others by this way of Satisfaction, or only of Imperation; and whether the Satisfaction (excepting only that of Jesus Christ) for Sin, or its Punishments is not made by God personal, and cannot be vicarious, or supplied by another, is disputed in the Schools; nor, on any side, a matter of Faith. 2.

y. See

